DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 180 JC 680 438

The Role of Industrial Relations Centers, Proceedings of a Regional Meeting of the International Industrial Relations Association (Chicago, May 17-18, 1968).

Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Industrial Relations Research Inst.

Pub Date Aug 68
Note-93p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.75
Descriptors-Conferences, *Extension Education, *Industrial Education, *Junior Colleges, *Labor Economics, Labor Problems, *Research

This meeting was held to exchange views on organization, operation, and goals of industrial relations centers, institutes, and schools. The opening speaker outlined the structure and functions of the international organization and of the regional conferences. The first paper, "Administrative Arrangements in Industrial Relations Centers," was based on a survey of U.S. and Canadian centers. The next paper, "Extension Activities of Industrial Relations Centers," stressed the importance of adult education courses for both unions and management and described the variety and problems of extension programs. The third topic, "Research Activities of Industrial Relations Centers," was covered by two papers. "Changing Patterns of Research" showed how emphasis was shifted from labor history and law, unions, and collective bargaining to labor market analysis, manpower policies, and international problems. "Contributions of Current Research" brought the topic up to date on current research achievements and needs. The fourth subject, "Resident Instruction in Industrial Relations Centers," was covered by a paper, "Industrial Relations Graduate Programs," on administration problems of graduate and degree programs, and by a paper, "Industrial Relations Degrees vs. Traditional Disciplines," on the controversy over the advantages of an industrial relations degree per se or a traditional degree (economics, law, sociology, etc.) with a concentration of industrial relations. Appropriate discussion followed each presentation. (HH)

ED031180

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Proceedings of a

Regional Meeting of

THE INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
in
Chicago, Illinois
May 17-18, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 14 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Reproduced at
The Industrial Relations Research Institute
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
August, 1968

PREFACE

The first North American regional meeting of the International Industrial Relations Association was centered on discussions of THE ROLE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS. The meeting was attended by 70 persons, principally from Canada and the United States but also had representatives from as far as Israel and the Philippines.

Comments of the participants indicated that the conference was successful in achieving its major purpose: an interchange of views on the organization, goals, and operations of industrial relations centers, institutes, and schools. The meeting was opened by Gerald G. Somers, Director of the Industrial Relations Research Institute at the University of Wisconsin and an Executive Board member of the International Industrial Relations Association. Professor Somers outlined the structure and functions of the international organization and indicated the role of this regional conference in relationship to other regional conferences and to a session to be devoted to a similar topic at the Second World Congress in 1970.

Under the chairmanship of Arnold Weber of the University of Chicago, Professor Julius Rezler presented a position paper on the "Administrative Arrangements in Industrial Relations Centers." Professor Rezler's analysis was based on an extensive survey which he had conducted among the centers in the United States and Canada on behalf of his own institute at Loyola University. Comments on Professor Rezler's paper made from the viewpoints of the institutes and schools which they head at their own universities were made by Professors John Crispo, University of Toronto; Jack Stieber, Michigan State University; and David Moore, Cornell University.

Dean Robert Risley of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University presented a paper on a very important function of many of the North American industrial relations institutes, namely, their adult education courses for union leadership and management personnel. Dean Risley's account of the far-reaching extension programs at Cornell University was supported by a general description of the variety of extension activities customarily conducted in the industrial relations field and by an analysis of the most important problems confronting extension programs. A discussion of Risley's paper was carried on by three faculty members who have had direct experience with union and management programs: Ben Seligman, University of Massachusetts; Frederic Meyers, University of California, Los Angeles; and Ronald Peters, Roosevelt University.

An afternoon session of the conference was devoted to what is probably the central function of many of the centers and institutes in North America: the conduct of research in the industrial relations field. Professor Martin Wagner, Director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Illinois chaired this session and introduced his colleague, Professor Milton Derber, who analyzed the changing pattern of industrial relations research. Professor Derber showed how the concentration in research had shifted from such subjects as labor history, unions, collective bargaining, and labor law to labor market analysis, manpower policies, and international labor problems. Professor Herbert Heneman, Jr., Director of the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Minnesota, carried Derber's discussion up to date and gave his views on the current contributions of industrial relations research. These presentations were appraised by the directors of prominent centers in Canada and the United States: Edward Jakubauskas, Iowa State University; Wallace Lonergan, University of Chicago; and William Westley, McGill University.

A major concern emerging from the discussion of industrial relations research was the need for more fundamental, basic, and long-term research. The temptation to follow the newspaper headlines in conducting short-run, applied research on changing current problems was deplored by a number of the speakers. It was felt that the solution of current problems would be facilitated through knowledge gained in basic research on the functions and analysis of unions, managements, labor markets, and industrial relations processes.

The final session of the conference was devoted to two papers and a subsequent discussion on resident instruction programs in industrial relations centers. Professor Alan Filley of the University of Wisconsin, discussed the problems of graduate instruction and degree programs in industrial relations from the vantage point of his own administrative role with regard to such programs at Wisconsin. Ronald Haughton, Co-Director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at Wayne State University, discussed an issue which has been a center of controversy in the industrial relations field for some years, that is the relative desirability of degrees in industrial relations as such as compared with degrees in traditional disciplines such as economics, psychology, sociology, or law with a concentration on industrial relations aspects of these. The heated discussion on this controversial issue was lead by the formal presentations of: Paul Kleinsorge, University of Oregon; Donald Wood, Queen's University; and Donald Sheriff, University of Iowa.

The participants came to no consensus with regard to the basic issues, however, it was generally concluded that a topic such as industrial relations requires an intensive focus and that such an objective can be attained by either an integrated industrial relations curriculum or by a traditional departmental degree with minor concentration in other disciplines.

The conference was honored to have as its featured dinner speaker, Dean George Shultz of the School of Business at the University of Chicago, who is currently president of the Industrial Relations Research Association, the major North American organization in the industrial relations field. Dean Shultz indicated how basic principles of industrial relations can be usefully applied to current problems of employment among the disadvantaged.

It is expected that the pattern of topics and discussions on THE ROLE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS experienced in the first North American regional meeting will serve as a useful guide to regional meetings on this same subject scheduled for Japan in March, 1969 and for Western Europe prior to the Second World Congress, scheduled for Geneva in 1970.

--------Gerald G. Somers

PARTICIPANTS

John Crispo
Director
Center for Industrial Relations
University of Toronto

Milton Derber
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations
University of Illinois

Alan Filley
Associate Director
Industrial Relations Research Institute
University of Wisconsin

Ronald Haughton
Co-Director
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations
Wayne State University

Herbert Heneman, Jr.
Director
Industrial Relations Center
University of Minnesota

Edward Jakubauskas
Director
Industrial Relations Center
Iowa State University

Paul Kleinsorge
Director
Institute of Industrial and Labor Relations
University of Oregon

Wallace Lonergan
Director
Industrial Relations Center
University of Chicago

Frederic Meyers
Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California, Los Angeles

David Moore
Dean
New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University

Ronald Peters
Extension Coordinator
Labor Education Division
Roosevelt University

Julius Rezler
Director
Institute of Industrial Relations
Loyola University

Robert Risley
New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University

Stanley Rosen
Coordinator
Labor Education Program
University of Illinois

Ben Seligman
Director
Labor Relations and Research Center
University of Massachusetts

Donald Sheriff
Director
Center for Labor and Management
University of Iowa

George Shultz
Dean
School of Business
University of Chicago

Gerald Somers
Director
Industrial Relations Research Institute
University of Wisconsin

Jack Stieber
Director
Industrial and Labor Relations School
Michigan State University

Martin Wagner
Director
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations
University of Illinois

Arnold Weber
Graduate School of Business
University of Chicago

William Westley
Director
Industrial Relations Center
McGill University

Donald Wood
Director
Industrial Relations Center
Queen's University

Herbert Zollitsch
Chairman
Industrial Management Department
Marquette University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS
Julius Rezler 1
DISCUSSION
John Crispo 11
Jack Stieber 13
David Moore 15

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS
Robert Risley 21
DISCUSSION
Ben Seligman 32
Frederic Meyers 35
Ronald Peters 38

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS
"The Changing Patterns of Research" -- Milton Derber 43
"Contributions of Current Research" -- Herbert Heneman, Jr. 49
DISCUSSION
Edward Jakubauskas 59
Wallace Lonergan 62
William Westley 65

RESIDENT INSTRUCTION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS
"The Industrial Relations Graduate Programs"
Alan Filley 71
"Industrial Relations Degrees vs. Traditional Disciplines"
Ronald Haughton 78
DISCUSSION
Paul Kleinsorge 81
Donald Sheriff 84
Donald Wood 87

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Arnold Weber, Chairman

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Julius Rezler
Loyola University

In the universities of the North American countries, the industrial relations centers represent the single most important organizational framework for the study of the complex phenomena and processes involved in modern labor-management relations. Industrial relations centers is a collective term comprising academic units which may operate under such different names as institutes, centers, bureaus, sections, divisions, etc. All of them, however, have two things in common: first, they are engaged in the study of employee relations primarily in unionized situations, and second, they generally function as an autonomous unit within the university structure.

Their importance and the fact that they satisfy educational, community, and research needs is indicated by their constantly growing number. Before World War II, only five such centers were in existence. At present, the number is estimated by various counts to be between 48 and 72 in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and according to recent information, several new centers are in the planning or preparatory phase.

Despite the growing educational and research activities pursued in industrial relations centers, until recently, relatively little attention was paid to their organizational aspects. While papers presented at Industrial Relations Research Association meetings in 1958, 1960, and 1962, examined such functional matters of industrial relations centers as the scope and volume of their research activity, degree and non-degree programs offered, their structure, and their relationship to other academic units within the university, organization has been largely neglected.

This author has recently surveyed some of the organizational and administrative arrangements prevailing among contemporary industrial relations centers. The results of this survey have been published in a recent issue of the Industrial and Labor Relations Review.[1] As the majority of this audience are readers of this journal, I do not wish to repeat in detail the data and the analysis presented in the article and will make reference to them only when it is unavoidable. Instead, the purpose of this paper is to develop a frameof reference for the analysis of the development of industrial relations centers and for the evaluation of their current administrative arrangements.

---

[1] Julius Rezler, "The Place of the Industrial Relations Programs in the Organizational Structure of the University," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 21 (January 1968), pp. 251-61.

To understand the present organizational set-up of the industrial relations centers, one has to go back to their origins. The beginning of the programs may be traced back to the early and mid-thirties. That was a period of ferment and experimentation not only for the American society and economy as a whole but also for the disciplines which were engaged in the study of the socioeconomic scene. Industrial relations as a legitimate and accepted subject of academic studies emerged parallel with the social, legal, and political developments of the New Deal.

The introduction of industrial relations centers has generally resulted from the necessity to examine employee relations from a viewpoint which was new and entirely different from the partly one-sided, partly ahuman traditional approach to the study of employee relations existing in the business schools and economics departments of that time. There had been two particular developments which required the new outlook denoted under the term "industrial relations": first, an increasing academic and business interest in employee relations as documented by the Hawthorne experiment and the subsequent emphasis on human relations in contrast with the previous impersonal approach of Taylorism; second, the growth of labor organizations supported by the administration and legislation of the New Deal, and their increasing role in the determination of the terms of employment.

Quite logically, the questions may be raised: Once the new industrial relations approach to the study of employee relations was established, why could it not be practiced in the already existing economics and business departments? Why was it necessary to develop new academic units for the study of industrial relations? From a retrospective point of view, it can be easily seen that the new industrial relations programs could not fit into these academic departments for two complex reasons. First, the economics or business departments which would have been primarily considered for adopting the new industrial relations approach were unwilling to include it in their traditional curricula. Second, certain basic characteristics of the industrial relations programs made it quite difficult to be pursued within the framework of a single academic department.

First let us survey briefly the attitude of economics and business departments toward the emerging industrial relations approach. Perhaps with the exception of the University of Wisconsin, the home of Commons' labor economics school, the economics departments of American universities were entirely dominated by the traditional neoclassical school of thought. This school considered labor as a commodity whose price would be determined by impersonal market forces just as the price of a bushel of wheat or a barrel of oil. Neoclassicists stubbornly denied that unions, and for that matter, management, could affect the process of wage determination for more than a short-run period as wages were held to be set by the marginal product of labor. Furthermore, any effort by outside forces to interfere with the process of wage determination was considered as detrimental to the welfare of the economy and to that of the workers. Therefore, any intentional effort on the part of unions and management to set the economic terms of employment, a major subject of industrial relations, was viewed by the academic economists of the thirties as an anomaly and deviation from the normal operation of the market. Thus, the acceptance of industrial relations in the curriculum of economics departments would have required the reconsideration and eventual modification of the basic assumptions and conclusions of the marginal productivity theory, the cornerstone of the school.

The departments of the business school were at that time not only unwilling to adopt the new approach to employee relations but showed outright hostility to its direction. Business schools have traditionally examined employee relations from the exclusive viewpoint of management, whereas unions, an integral component of industrial relations, were either disregarded or treated with unscientific animosity.

Along with the incompatibility of the industrial relations curriculum, either with neoclassical economics or with the ideology of the business school, certain basic characteristics of industrial relations programs constituted another major reason why they could not possibly fit into those traditional academic departments. The requirement for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of industrial relations is one of these characteristics. Employee relations, particularly when unions are also involved, represent a complex field of inquiry which cannot satisfactorily be studied in the framework of a single discipline. Economic phenomena and processes constitute only a part of the total picture which also contains historical, legal, sociological, and psychological elements of knowledge. In other words, a thorough and complete examination of industrial relations problems requires an interdisciplinary approach which can hardly be pursued in a single academic department. Consequently, in the past 30 years, at an increasing number of universities and colleges, a conscious or instinctive effort has been made by the cultivators of industrial relations to develop such an organizational framework within which members of the related disciplines could collectively participate and make joint contributions to the field of industrial relations without getting into jurisdictional conflict with their own departments. These efforts have resulted in the establishment of the various centers, institutes, etc., dedicated exclusively to the study of industrial relations.

The controversial nature of industrial relations has been the other basic factor of the industrial relations approach which has constantly exerted an influence on the organization of industrial relations centers. These programs from the very beginning have been characterized by their two-dimensional nature. In most of the industrial relations issues and processes studied, management and unions are organically involved and not only have conflicting interests in these matters but also offer different interpretations of the phenomena emerging in their relationship. Because of this duality of the problems studied in industrial relations programs, the issues involved in industrial relations cannot be understood and solved if examined only from the viewpoint of one of the parties; a one-sided approach would render a distorted and self-serving picture. Therefore, a balanced discussion of industrial relations issues which takes the views of both sides into account, at least at the exposition of the problem, has been a basic methodological requirement for industrial relations programs and is another factor which has placed them necessarily outside the walls of the economics departments and the business schools which, as outlined above, exhibited an entirely one-sided approach to the study of employee relations. Consequently, the requirement for a balanced or impartial approach to the study of industrial relations has been another powerful factor for the establishment of an autonomous unit within the university structure where students would not be bound by the bias of the traditional academic departments concerning industrial relations.

As a clarification, however, it should be stated here that the requirement for impartiality in treating industrial relations issues does not mean that the instructor or researcher involved in an industrial relations center should not have his own view on an issue under study. This would be an impractical and hardly possible demand on the scholarly integrity of industrial relations students, as all of us, on the basis of our value system, form a definite view on the various issues emerging in industrial relations which in some cases would be similar to the stand taken by labor and in other cases would agree with the management viewpoint. Impartiality in this context would only require the teacher or researcher in an industrial relations program to present both sides of an issue before he takes his own stand on it.

In the previous discussion I have tried to outline those factors, inherent either in the traditional economics and business departments or in the industrial relations discipline, which have necessitated and caused the development of separate and autonomous units for the study of the latter. In the second half of this paper, I will evaluate some organizational and administrative arrangements which have been adopted by various industrial relations centers. Perhaps the most significant finding of my previously mentioned survey of industrial relations centers was that while they operate in the same subject area, they differ widely in their organizational and administrative arrangements as well as in their functions.

The diversity of such arrangements prevailing among industrial relations centers certainly warrants the evaluation of these alternatives. Such evaluation may take place on the basis of several criteria. For example, the efficiency of an administrative arrangement may be ascertained by considering the cost of its operation in relation to the quality and quantity of its performance. This time, the various alternatives available to industrial relations programs to organize their operations will be evaluated entirely from the viewpoint of how they satisfy the two basic requirements of an industrial relations program, namely the application of an interdisciplinary approach, and the possibility of an impartial or balanced treatment of the issues involved.

In my paper in the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, I presented the alternatives available to industrial relations programs for administrative arrangements without making an attempt to evaluate them. However, one must consider which of the alternatives is most suitable to satisfy the two previously stated requirements. It is recognized that the forthcoming evaluative statements are preliminary and speculative, but since the heads of the industrial relations centers are well represented at this meeting, I am reasonably sure that any error will be corrected in the subsequent discussion.

The Organizational Level of Industrial Relations Centers

The first question posed for our nonquantitative evaluative process revolves around the optimum organizational level at which an industrial relations center should operate to perform its work satisfactorily. Should it function on a departmental or divisional level, or should it form a school? The answer to this question may be given by considering the requirements of an interdisciplinary approach. From the viewpoint of organizational theory, it seems to be appropriate that an interdisciplinary program should operate at least one notch above the level of the departments which are involved in the program. Otherwise the head of the program could not properly perform his coordinating function. Particularly if the industrial relations program draws its faculty and research staff from other departments, it is imperative that the organizational level of the program and the rank of its head would be on a level higher than the departments which furnish the staff of the program. This is necessary to assure that the director would have an effective voice in selecting a faculty which is qualified to participate in the program.

It was found in my published survey that somewhat more than half of the 47 industrial relations centers in the sample operate on a departmental level and less than 40 percent of the centers function above that level as divisions or schools. Most of the major programs offering a graduate degree, however, are in the latter category.

The problem of the director's rank within the university hierarchy is a function of the organizational status of his program. Under normal circumstances, the latter determines the rank of the director.

Affiliation of Industrial Relations Centers

Another organizational arrangement which is a matter of major concern to the administrators of industrial relations centers is the affiliation of the program with a major division of the university. Is the work performed in an industrial relations center best served by an affiliation with the school of social sciences, or is it preferable to become an integral part of the business school or of the school of arts and sciences? At first, it may appear a mere quibbling whether or not an industrial relations center should be affiliated with this or that school. However, particularly to satisfy the requirement of impartiality, the type of affiliation has a major bearing on the work of the industrial relations center. It is felt that in view of the traditional, one-sided approach to employee relations prevailing in the majority of business schools, a balanced discussion of industrial relations issues would become problematic if the industrial relations centers were affiliated with a business school. It should also be registered that, in the past, many of the business schools have shown little understanding toward the particular approach of industrial relations programs, and their administrators are convinced that the M.B.A. programs make industrial relations centers unnecessary.

But even if the dean and the department heads of the business school would not interfere with the operation of an industrial relations center, the fact that it is located within a business school would endanger its appeal to unions, as business schools are identified with management in the eyes of union leaders.

In view of the requirement for impartiality, it is suggested that the optimum arrangement for a large industrial relations program would be to operate as a separate school. If because of its size or for some other considerations this solution is not possible, then a program offering a graduate degree should seek affiliation with the graduate school. In case of an undergraduate program, either the school of social sciences or the school of arts and sciences should be considered for the purpose of affiliation. If the program is primarily involved in a nondegree curriculum, then the logical affiliation would be with the extension division of the university or with an interdisciplinary committee formed by the deans of the various schools involved.

As to the present situation in the area of affiliation, according to my survey, about 20 percent of the centers are not affiliated with any other major university division, 26 percent are within a business school, 13 percent are affiliatedwith a graduate school, 20 percent either with the school of social sciences or with the college of arts and sciences. Finally, 13 percent of the centers were supervised by an interdisciplinary body.

Staffing of Industrial Relations Centers

Staffing a center is the third organizational aspect to be discussed. There are several alternative arrangements in this area. Some programs have their own full-time faculty and research staff appointed exclusively to the program. In some other cases, faculty members receive joint appointments to the center and to one of the related departments but are permanently assigned to the industrial relations center. In the third case, industrial relations centers do not have their own faculty and members of other departments are assigned to them either on a permanent or on a temporary basis.

Of the previously mentioned alternatives, the last one would be the least desirable from the standpoint of satisfying the particular requirements of an industrial relations program for several reasons. First, if the faculty of an industrial relations center is furnished by other departments on a permanent or part-time basis, conflicts may develop between the director and the respective department heads as to the quality and utilization of the assigned instructors. Second, such arrangements may also affect the morale of the faculty members temporarily assigned to the industrial relations center. It is possible that during the period of their outside assignment, they may also have to carry a double administrative load such as advising students, attending faculty meetings, being on committees in both the industrial relations center and in their regular department. This may dampen considerably their enthusiasm to teach in an industrial relations program. Those faculty members who have bargaining power would avoid such assignments and in that event the program would be left with second-rate instructors.

Another argument which speaks against staffing industrial relations centers from other departments is that the director would have little control over the hiring of the instructors to teach courses and to conduct research in the center. Instructors would be hired by the head of the department on a permanent basis. In such a case the director could not be certain that the departments which supply his instructors would hire persons capable of teaching the specialized industrial relations courses. Further complications may develop if the department head, who himself takes a negative view of industrial relations, hires and assigns faculty members who may take the position that collective bargaining is no good and should be eliminated.

Perhaps these prospects are somewhat exaggerated, and in most cases where there is a good working relationship between the director of the program and the department heads, such problems would not occur. Nevertheless the examples cited indicate the dangers present in an arrangement where the industrial relations center must rely on other departments for instructional and research staff.

On the basis of the previous considerations it must be quite obvious that the best staffing arrangement satisfying the special requirements of an industrial relations center is the one in which there is a permanent faculty. In such a case the director has full control over his staff and is able to hire a faculty trained in the interdisciplinary field of industrial relations. The permanency of the staff would also enhance the efficiency of the center's operations.

In connection with staffing, an interesting question was recently raised by Albert Blum, namely, whether union or management spokesmen can teach courses in an industrial relations program without endangering the requirement for balanced discussion of the issues?[2] I agree with Mr. Blum in that it would not be appropriate to ask a union or management representative to teach a whole course in the industrial relations core-curriculum such as Labor History, Principles of Collective Bargaining, or Labor Economics. However, representatives of the two parties involved in labor relations may usefully be invited by the instructors of such courses to present their side on a particular issue of controversial nature.

My survey on the staffing arrangements of industrial relations centers found that the great majority of the 47 industrial relations centers in the sample operate with a full-time faculty or research staff who are either appointed directly to the center or receive joint appointments; for all practical purposes, however, they devote their full time to the industrial relations program. I found that in only a few cases the industrial relations programs were staffed on a temporary basis. In many instances, however, in addition to the own faculty of the program, members of the other departments are invited from time to time to conduct classes in their specialty on a part-time basis.

Based upon the evaluation of these important administrative arrangements prevailing among industrial relations centers, one may conclude that an ideal center would have the following arrangements: first, it would function as a school or a university division; second, the rank of its head would correspond to that of a dean or a division head within the university hierarchy; third, the program would either not be affiliated with any major university division, or depending on its size and the academic program offered, it would be affiliated either with the graduate school, or with the school of social science or with an interdisciplinary committee; finally, the industrial relations center would have its own faculty, though in certain special cases, at the invitation of the director, the center would rely on the competency of members of related departments on a part-time basis.

---

[2] Albert A. Blum, "Geese and Swans: The Salzburg Seminar in American Studies," (in mimeo).

In conclusion, it is realized that a thorough evaluation of industrial relations programs requires more research than was involved in this paper. It is hoped, however, that at least the issues have been exposed for a subsequent discussion which may fill the void and offer further suggestions for a major project dealing with the evaluation of the organizational and administrative arrangements existing in various industrial relations centers.

DISCUSSION

John H.G. Crispo
University of Toronto

Mr. Rezler has provided us with both historical perspective and current insight into the problems confronting those who work in industrial relations centers. I have no quarrel with his interpretation of the forces leading to the emergence of such centers, but I have a major bone to pick with him about the directions in which many of them seem to be moving.

Since my views on this subject are colored by my own experience, I should make the background from which I speak clear. By many of Mr. Rezler's standards, I come from a relatively undernourished and undeveloped center. Although we enjoy a virtually autonomous interdisciplinary position within the university, we do not have the status of a division, department, or school. While we can utilize all of the full-time and part-time personnel our research resources permit us to take on, our permanent staff is limited to two-thirds of my own time as director, to a librarian, to a secretary, and to an assistant secretary. Neither our powers nor our resources allow us to offer either courses or degrees, but they do enable us to promote research and sponsor conferences. In many respects, therefore, we fall decidely short of Mr. Rezler's ideal center. And yet, except for the perennial shortage of funds and first-rate research personnel that plagues us all, we are not unhappy with our present situation.

My basic criticism of Mr. Rezler's model center relates to his underlying assumption. At the risk of flogging a dead horse and offending many, if not most, of those present, I have to express my misgivings about treating industrial relations in the same manner as the more traditional disciplines. Old-fashioned as the notion may be, I still believe that our field is best served by those who have a solid grounding in a field such as law, sociology, or economics. My judgment is that the contribution to quality research and scholarship in industrial relations by these types of individuals far outweighs that of those who enter the field by taking a little bit of this and a little bit of that but nothing in depth.

Given my bias in this matter, it follows that I do not see the need for the kind of center Mr. Rezler envisages. This is because I see such a unit essentially playing a coordinating role within the university. To me its primary purpose should be to promote interdisciplinary work in industrial relations regardless of the discipline _or_ division, department _or_ school from which the interested faculty members or students may come. It does not take a whole new division, department, or school--let alone some new body with an even higher status--to serve this purpose.

But returning to my own experience, I think it does take something more than what our center is currently offering. For one thing, I think an industrial relations center should offer at least one general interdisciplinary research seminar for credit in all divisions, departments, and schools that are willing to recognize it. Even more important should be the availability of sufficient funds to keep an active research program under way. This program should involve both full- and part-time personnel drawn from on and off the campus. Research contracts should be employed not only to encourage existing faculty and students to work in industrial relations, but also to help other units in the university attract more personnel with a similar interest.

In this brief commentary I have had to skip over certain issues and altogether ignore others. Take for example the question of labor-management education. Here again I would argue that we should avoid empire building. By cooperating with existing university extension services and drawing on practitioners wherever possible, an adequate program can be offered without building up an elaborate operation within our centers.

Essentially what I am trying to say is that industrial relations centers are most likely to carve out a legitimate niche for themselves by establishing a credible research record. To do that I do not think we need to think in terms of all the attributes of a division, department, or school. Indeed, that might do us more harm than good.

Perhaps I should add one guarded caveat. I recognize that the administrative arrangements which apply to industrial relations centers must vary with the purposes for which they were created and with the general institutional setting within which they operate. I suppose I should not be disturbed if centers deliberately carve out a larger than necessary role for themselves or if they choose to play the same bureaucratic game as everyone else in the university. I only hope that we in our center have the sense to resist either or both temptations.

Jack Stieber
Michigan State University

Julius Rezler has given us a valuable summary of the rationale for the creation of industrial relations centers, institutes, and schools in the United States and a useful survey of the strengths and weaknesses of different structural and staffing arrangements of such organizations. In my brief comments I shall make some observations on the conclusions which Mr. Rezler has drawn from his data and give some personal views, based on my own experience of 12 years in the School of Labor and Industrial Relations of Michigan State University.

Mr. Rezler goes to some pains to explain why the study of industrial relations often does not find a hospitable environment in exisiting departments of economics. Not mentioned by Mr. Rezler is the trend, not only in economics but also in other social science disciplines, towards emphasizing study for the Ph.D. degree and down-grading Master's degree programs. At many universities, students who profess a desire to take a terminal Master's degree in economics, sociology, psychology and political science are given less consideration for admission into graduate programs than those whose objective is the Ph.D. Where does this leave the student who wishes to prepare himself for an industrial relations career in business, government, or unions? He must either enroll in an M.B.A. program where he gets a large number of courses in general business, accounting, financial administration, business policy, and perhaps a smattering of personnel management, or look for a university which offers a Master's degree in industrial relations. Based on our experience at Michigan State University and what I know about other graduate programs, both students who hope to be practitioners in the industrial relations field and prospective employers find that their interests are better served by graduate programs in industrial relations schools and centers than in business schools or traditional social science departments.

With respect to Mr. Rezler's observations on the organization of industrial relations units, I find myself in disagreement with several of his conclusions:

(1) I see no difficulty in an industrial relations unit functioning effectively at the same level as a department, headed by a director or chairman who reports to a dean and is on a par with other department chairmen. This has been the arrangement at Michigan State since 1962 and it has worked well.

It offers the advantage of having equal status with and being accepted by other departments and faculty who otherwise might be inclined to regard an industrial relations unit, especially if it carries on extension programs as well as research and teaching, as a nonacademic pursuit established primarily for political reasons and using up money which could be better spent in existing departments. Actually, I am surprised that Mr. Rezler's survey found that close to 40 percent of all industrial relations units function "above" the department level.

(2) Staffing an industrial relations unit can and does proceed in a variety of ways: full-time faculty assigned exclusively to the center or school, permanent joint appointments with other social sciences, temporary joint appointments for specific purposes, etc. Each arrangement has its advantages and disadvantages. While a separate full-time faculty might seem to be the best arrangement, it requires a fairly extensive curriculum and a sizable student body. Given the variety of disciplines which contribute to the industrial relations field, the faculty must be drawn from a number of different disciplines. But many industrial relations units do not offer enough courses or have enough students to justify full-time appointments, even allowing for time set aside for research. This is particularly true for centers and schools offering only graduate programs as is the case in most universities. In such situations joint appointments which enable a faculty member to divide his time between two departments can be to the mutual benefit of the individual faculty member and the departments involved. Mr. Rezler has noted the problems which joint appointments may present in securing agreement as to the faculty members to be shared. My own experience is that where department chairmen are interested in making joint appointments work, they have no difficulty in working things out satisfactorily. Unfortunately, some departments are not inclined to cooperate on joint appointments, and this can present real problems to proper staffing of an industrial relations unit.

(3) I am less concerned than Mr. Rezler about allowing union or management "spokesmen" to teach industrial relations courses. It is not clear whether he is referring to persons currently employed by a union or a company, to persons with a "commitment" to one side or the other, as in the case of staff members whose primary assignment is to teach labor or management extension programs, or to both. I would point out that the Ph.D. is not in itself an indicator of impartiality or objectivity. I know union and

management representatives who are more objective in their views on industrial relations issues than some academicians. Furthermore, a "committed" individual often makes a better teacher than one who takes great pains to present a so-called "balanced" view. At MSU we occasionally use faculty associated with both our labor and management extension programs to teach in our academic program. When we can find them we also give short-term appointments to competent persons who have recently retired or are on leave from their positions with unions and companies. The only criterion is knowledge of the subject and ability to present it. The students know the background of the instructor and evaluate his performance accordingly. More important than a balanced presentation by each and every instructor is "balance" in the over-all composition of the faculty. This gives students opportunity to sample a variety of approaches and draw their own conclusions.

Finally, I would say that there is no ideal administrative arrangement for an industrial relations institute, center, or school. Each unit must adapt to its university and community environment in a way which it finds feasible and viable. What works well in one university may be a poor arrangement in another. More important than any particular administrative arrangement is support from both the labor and management community, and a strong commitment on the part of the top administration of the university to the idea of an industrial relations unit which will serve the academic community as well as labor and management. Without this support, the "ideal" administrative arrangement will be found wanting; with it an industrial relations unit can thrive under any one of a variety of administrative arrangements.

David Moore
Cornell University

Mr. Rezler has presented a very interesting analysis of the factors which have shaped the structures of industrial and labor relations institutes and centers and of the type of organization which is likely to be most effective in developing the industrial and labor relations field. I wholly agree with his conclusion that the field of industrial and labor relations can best be developed on any campus if it is granted the status of a school with some degree of autonomy and independence. Of course, any field is likely to be given greater impetus if it enjoys high status and continuous financial support. The industrial and labor relations field will never be fully developed until there are a number of key institutions across the country with integrated programs which are fully supported from both a fiscal and administrative standpoint.

The question, therefore, of what kind of structure is most likely to be effective in developing the industrial and labor relations field does not concern me. What does concern me is why this has not happened and why there has been such a hodgepodge of structural arrangements in an important interdisciplinary field. I am quite certain that I can not answer this question definitively, but perhaps I can add a few things to what Mr. Rezler has already pointed out to us.

The structure of a university and its component parts is shaped by internal political forces which reflect two major organizational strategies--one disciplinary and related to particular theoretical and methodological approaches and one interdisciplinary and related to particular applied problems or areas which cut across traditional lines. There is a constant tugging and pulling between these two organizational strategies or themes. Sometimes one theme is in ascendancy, and sometimes the other. It is probably true that the trends are cyclical in the life of a single university with a resurgenece of disciplinary forces as the university becomes too severly fractionated by interdisciplinary interests and with a resurgence of interdisciplinary forces as the disciplines become irrelevant and sterile in the face of emerging problems or changing research methods.

Interdisciplinary efforts have come and gone with the problems of the day. Thus, civil rights, race relations, and urban development have attracted the interests of many social scientists over the past several years. Centers, committees, and institutes are already developing in a number of locations to give structure to the interests of faculty and to channel financial and other support for these interests.

Why do some interdisciplinary centers continue over long periods of time and others disappear after the foundation grant runs out? I would submit that the interdisciplinary structures which last for any period of time are those which capture long-term support and sustained interest. This means, in turn, that some group or groups in our society with considerable economic or political muscle want a particular teaching and research interest to be perpetuated. A law school could not exist without lawyers and a basic need in our society for them. The same is true of business schools and medical schools. No one questions the necessity for supporting these professional schools in the university.

Sometimes, particular structures are supported as a matter of equity. Thus, schools of home economics are supported out of a desire to do something for the ladies and perhaps to demonstrate that the university is not wholly godless and sinful since it believes in motherhood and the family.

The rise of labor unions as important institutions in our society is of crucial importance to the development of industrial and labor relations institutes and centers through the country. Without labor unions, management and employee relations would be treated as a minor subject in the business school or social science curriculum.

Labor unions, however, have altered the picture, for here is a group with considerable political power which requires some kind of academic response. If labor unions were noncontroversial and wholly accepted in our society, we would have at the university level "schools of labor" which would be comparable to schools of business or schools of agriculture or schools of medicine, theology or law. A "labor school" actually could be organized which was very similar in broad outline to a school of business. Its mission would be to train individuals to undertake careers in labor unions and to develop their capacities to make economic, social, and political analyses; to advertise, market, and sell the merits of union organization; to assess the needs of union membership in the development of demands; to administer union organizations of considerable complexity; and to play an increasingly active role in national and international affairs. While this effort might at first blush seem rather odd, it is no more farfetched than any of the other professional educational activities of the university. Indeed, the concern of union leadership with social and economic problems makes the subject matter in some ways far more lively than many other professional fields.

The fact that no "labor school" has been developed indicates certain limitations. The first limitation grows out of the nature of labor unions as democratic institutions in which the leadership is for the most part political and elected. Education and training, therefore, are applicable only after the individual has reached a position of leadership in the union. Still further, there has been very little professional training offered in any university for careers in politics since this suggests the development of a political elite of some kind. Unions are, after all, political organizations; universities have shied away from too obvious an effort to strengthen them for fear of becoming directly involved in political activity.

But there is a less general and exalted reason for the restraint in the response of universities to the challenge of strong labor unions and that is the antagonism of business and other groups (including university officials) to unions and union activity. This hostility was much stronger 20 years ago when industrial relations centers and institutes were first being established than it is today. As a consequence, the focus of industrial and labor relations institutes two decades ago had to be on developing management-labor peace rather than on developing the strength of union leadership and union organization.

Finally, there has been the suspicion of labor officialdom itself toward the intellectual snobbery and highly symbolic behavior of the academic community. Most union leaders in this country have considerable respect for higher education and are willing to support it for their children, but they are not particularly sanguine about what it can do for their unions. They like the idea of a school or institute on the university campus which is somehow identified with labor; they are interested in extension-type programs, particularly if they are supported by state funds; they enjoy the prestige of participation in university life. But they are not especially interested in research and tedious theories or in hiring graduates of industrial and labor relations schools for key positions in their organizations.

Accordingly, the industrial and labor relations centers and institutes have developed as relatively weak and undeveloped structures at most universities. If they do nothing else, they provide extension programs for labor usually balanced by programs for management. If they go beyond this, they may undertake to sponsor research, usually supported by federal funds. If a sufficient number of professors are involved, degree programs, usually at the graduate level, may be offered.

The typical industrial and labor relations center on most campuses is not yet the answer to the challenge posed by the development and growth of strong and politically powerful labor unions in the United States. Perhaps, however, there never will be an answer unless there is a drastic change in the demands made by unions on higher education for support through education and research. Without such direct demands, the influences which shape industrial and labor relations centers or institutes are likely to be indirect and mainly an expression of the needs of state and federal governmental agencies for policy and action research.

It is conceivable that well established schools of industrial and labor relations might gain stature as institutes of applied social science with a special concern for interinstitutional conflict, accommodation, and cooperation. Interest would focus on the key institutions in our society and the structure of relationships which must develop if stability and progress are to be achieved in our society. Since the mission would be the public good, support would have to come primarily from government rather than any single institution like business or labor.

EXTENSION ACTIVITES OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Stanley Rosen, Chairman

EXTENSION ACTIVITES OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Robert F. Risley
Cornell University

Industrial and labor relations, like other fields of professional education, is a subject for both academic teaching and research and a field of daily activity for practitioners. The problems and issues faced by practitioners, the environment within which practitioners function, and the social, economic, and political pressures of the community on labor and management activities are matters studied by university faculty members. The results of such studies are made available to students and practitioners in publications and through educational programs.

The nature of the field demands continuous interaction between the industrial relations centers and the practitioners: without such interaction, the faculty of the centers would lose touch with the reality of the field; without educational programs and publications designed for practitioners, the knowledge accumulated from research and study would not reach the field. This close link between the practical world and the academic world is recognized in all industrial relations centers.

It is from these general premises that I undertake to develop my thoughts regarding the role of extension activities in industrial relations centers. Let me begin by assuring you that I do not plan to develop a comprehensive listing of the nature and type of courses offered by extension industrial relations centers. We all know that there is a variety of programs, the nature of which vary depending upon the community served by and the faculty of the centers. Such references to specific programs as I may make will be for illustrative purposes only.

In describing the nature of the extension activities in industrial relations centers, I will be speaking in general terms. Some or all of the activities may be present in some centers, but in general one or another of the activities are present in different combinations in all centers. It should be clear from the discussions at this and other sessions at this meeting that each of the centers has developed a "personality" of its own. This personality, like that of individuals, is influenced heavily by heredity and environment. By this I mean that the parents of each center--the university, the college, and the faculty involved in its establishment--have an influence on the nature of the center's interests and activities.

Thus, one finds that centers which have developed under sponsorship of economics departments are likely to place a greater emphasis on economic issues; a center which has developed under the auspices of a business school is more likely to have a business orientation; etc. Centers which have grown up in urban communities with specific industrial and labor relations problems have generally developed programs designed to serve the special needs of these communities. The nature of state legislation, the extent of union organization, and economic conditions also serve to differentiate one state program from another. Over a period of time, as the centers develop, the environmental pressures tend to modify the original nature of the centers. One environmental pressure which plays a considerable role in the development of a center program and its extension activities has been the traditions and policies of the university of which the center is a part.

Because of these factors of heredity and environment, it is not possible to talk about a common program of extension activities in industrial relations centers. Even within a state-wide program, there are many variations from one section to another. To my mind, this lack of uniformity is a positive attribute because it indicates that center extension programs have realistically tried to meet the educational problems of the communities which they serve.

I would like to offer a concept of extension in industrial relations centers--a concept which, while not applicable completely to any center, serves to desribe the broad objectives of most centers and provides a generalized rationale for the extension activities of all industrial relations centers.

These activities serve at one and the same time several purposes in the center. The first and foremost purpose--that generally cited as the function of extension--is to provide education to those engaged in the practice of industrial and labor relations. This education programming is designed to serve the needs of practitioners at all levels. It provides opportunity for basic education and training to those entering the field to equip them to carry on their activities. In this category are basic programs for labor union officers and members in steward training and grievance handling, and basic programs for management personnel specialists and management labor relations representatives to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities in the organization. In many instances, this type of programming constitutes the major activity of extension. The number of individuals who need such education and training is, of course, large. Moreover, the individuals who are in this category are a constantly changing group with new persons coming in and others moving on to increased responsibilities or new activities. This task of basic education and training is a never-ending one.

A second type of ecuation provided through the extension programs is the more sophisticated and specialized training for individuals who have special needs in selected areas. In this category are programs dealing with techniques for collective bargaining, preparation for arbitration, personnel selection, wage and salary administration, job evaluation, and time and motion study. The individuals interested in such subjects are generally persons who have experience and competency in the field but who desire further education and training in specific aspects of industrial relations.

A third function of extension programs is that of providing information and education regarding new developments and trends. This frequently takes the form of conferences or institutes designed to bring new ideas and up-to-date information to practitioners and to assist them in keeping up with the rapid growth and changes in the industrial relations field. Industrial relations, like all fields today, is one in which changes in the state of the knowledge, the problems, and the social framework within which the problems are to be resolved, make it imperative that practitioners engage in continuing education. Truly, no one can be said to have completed his education; each person in the field must continue through reading, educational programs, professional meetings, conferences, etc., to strive to keep abreast with the changes and developments.

Another activity is the development of workshops, conferences, and institutes which seek to provide an opportunity for practitioners to explore the various social, political, and economic problems with which we are faced and to gain insights into how their own activities may contribute to resolving them. In almost every type of program which is on the priority agenda of the nation, from revitalizing of cities and the development of better housing to providing better educational employment opportunities for minority group members, there is a need for action on the part of management and labor. The industrial relations centers, with access to these groups and being in a position to draw upon the resources of the university of which they are a part, have been making contributions toward the resolution of these problems.

Certainly the categories which I have listed are not all inclusive of the extension activities of industrial relations centers, but they do indicate the breadth and scope of the extension programs conducted by the industrial relations centers. Techniques of instruction differ greatly depending upon the program purpose and the groups being served. Increasingly, teaching aids, such as written materials, films, video tapes, programmed learning, and other techniques are being utilized to expand and strengthen the activities of the center programs. Teaching methods run the gamut from the lecture, which permits a relatively small amount of classroom discussion, to member-centered conferences which encourage a high degree of student participation. Problems are frequently analyzed through role-playing, case studies, discussion clinics, and other action methods. Many of the programs require participants to complete reading assignments or other outside work. In addition to the regular university faculty members who teach in extension, qualified persons from outside the university often are invited to join the instructional team.

Among the numerous centers there are differences in the emphasis placed upon general or open-enrollment programs and programs designed for specific organizations. All centers do have some programs in both categories. Centers like the University of California and the University of Pennsylvania which have strong general extension programs offer industrial relations courses for credit, while other centers located where there is no general extension service--for example, the one at Cornell--concentrate on noncredit offerings.

Whether programs are developed for general enrollment or for specific groups, they are typically designed to meet the special needs of participants. Those offered for general enrollment specify the level at which the topic is to be considered as well as the general requirements for registration. Those developed for members or associates of a specific organization are, of course, designed to meet the needs and interests of the group.

In addition to formal educational services which the industrial relations centers provide, the centers offer other types of assistance. All of them have developed some kind of publications program through which they communicate information and research findings to practitioners in the field. Members of the center staffs are available for consultation with practioners about their special problems. Staff members also frequently support and encourage development of professional associations of practitioners.

Because extension educational work is more flexible, and, in most instances, noncredit, the way in which the programs are designed and the techniques used generally lend themselves to greater experimentation than do resident programs. Moreover, the fact that participants in these programs are practitioners with experience in the daily dealings of industrial and labor relations offers a challenge to those developing and conducting programs to utilize methods which will provide active involvement on the part of the participants.

One of the topics of heated debate on most campuses these days is the quality and nature of the instruction being provided for students. In the extension field, it is essential that the instruction be meaningful and well done. Extension has no "captive" students taking required courses or persons resigned to the fact that they must put in so many hours of study in order to receive a degree. In extension, it is the job of those providing the education to interest the students so that they will return to the next session or program. This constant challenge to those who are responsible for developing and teaching in extension activites leads to greater innovation and experimentation.

While I might well elaborate on the programs and the services provided for practitioners, I would like to look at some other roles the extension function plays in an industrial relations center. The extension function is closely involved and allied with the research and resident teaching functions of the center. These aspects of the extension role are often overlooked and, in most instances, are underdeveloped. Nevertheless, opportunities remain to exploit these relationships to the fullest, and such opportunities have been pursued in some of the centers.

First, in relation to the research function, the extension division has three definable roles. One relates to the need for getting information about industrial and labor relations research being carried on in universities into the hands of practitioners so that it may become a part of the improvement of the practice of industrial relations. This need to put research results into the practitioners' hands in usable fashion is one which is faced by all types of professional schools. At one time, it was sufficient to believe that students would graduate and bring to the field new ideas and methods, but today there is an increasing urgency to close the time gap in moving research findings from the university to the field of practice. Extension activities provide a valuable channel for this. Through extension publications, through extension teachers, and through specially organized seminars and conferences conducted by the researchers themselves, the ideas and findings of research are brought to the practitioners.

It should be remembered that in many instances research reports of industrial relations faculty members and others in the university setting are designed for professional colleagues and not for the practitioner. This offers an important role for extension in that its subject matter specialists may serve, in effect, as "translators" of the research findings, putting them into the language of the practitioner. I am sure that all of us have found instances where studies with results that we consider exciting fall on deaf ears at the practitioner level, in many instances because these findings are not seen as usuable in the context of the practitioners' orientation. Thus, the extension staff may form a bridge between the world of the campus and the world of the practitioner.

A second function that extension can play in relation to research is to provide problems and ideas from the field which suggest hypotheses for research. In working with the practitioners, needs for research studies are often disclosed, and extension personnel transmit these suggestions to persons interested in research. From these grow research projects and proposals.

A third function related to research is the fact that relationships developed by the extension activities with practitioners in labor, management, and government can lead to opportunities for research sites. Individuals concerned with research in the industrial relations field often find it difficult to locate organizations willing to participate in research. The fact that union leaders and management representatives have been involved in extension activities often provides entree to organizational settings for research. If the extension staff is alert to these possibilities, discussion of educational program plans can include commitments for research activities. For example, if a hospital indicates that it wishes to have a program developed for the training of its supervisory and managerial staff in the subject of employee relations, discussion of plans for this program might include the idea of undertaking research in the hospital to explore the relationships and problems of the hospital staff.

The great potentials for research which exist as a result of extension relationships are oftentimes overlooked, not only by the extension staff but also by the other faculty members of the industrial relations centers. Not only can staff research be facilitated through these relationships, but of equal importance, there is the possibility of providing arrangements for graduate students to do research connected with thesis studies in organizations involved in extension activities.

There are other aspects of this relationship which should be recognized. The extension activities provide opportunity for resident faculty members to meet with and to become involved in discussions and relationships with practitioners in a setting that enables both practitioner and faculty member to benefit from each other. From extension involvements, faculty members are able to test their ideas and concepts against current practice in the field. Through discussion and participation in programs they are able to gain additional knowledge and understanding of what various organizations are doing and trends in industrial relations practice. Thus, from this contact with the practitioners, faculty members gain in their ability to keep current and updated the subject matter which they teach.

There is a need to continually revise course emphasis and to keep alive the content of class presentations. In this respect, the industrial relations center faculty are faced with the same problems which face faculty in the other professional schools. The changing nature of the field with which they are concerned makes it imperative that they continue to update their courses and course requirements. This is more critical in some subjects, of course, than in others, but generally it is true for all of the subjects offered in the industrial relations centers' resident teaching programs.

In addition to providing important opportunities for bringing scholar and practitioner together, there is another role that the extension can play in relation to resident instruction. Most of us know well that our students want to be involved in something worthwhile. Part of the restlessness that we find on campuses and in classrooms is related to the feeling of a great many youths that important things are happening outside and that much of what is occurring within the university classroom is meaningless or irrelevant. Extension activities can be utilized as one channel for harnessing some of the students' restlessness and energy. This can be done by developing opportunities for students, either as part of their course work or as a voluntary activity, to participate in organizing and conducting extension activities. Students can be used as assistants to develop materials, to do limited research, and to observe and evaluate the program activities being carried on with organizations. Such opportunities not only will give students the chance to do something useful, but also will provide an important way of letting them obtain experiences and insights which enable them to better see the relevancy of what they are studying.

As a fourth and final aspect, let me comment briefly on the important function which extension plays in developing support and recognition for the institution. In our program at Cornell, as in the other centers, we deal with many thousands of persons a year. Last year, we conducted over 400 programs and had approximately 13,000 practitioners involved in them. In addition, program announcements and promotional materials regarding extension activities reached uncounted thousands more. To the general public, to the practitioners, and to public officials who, in many instances, are faced with determining where state dollars must go, these activities serve the important function of providing a public image visible to all of the institution and its work. In any center, the number of persons reached directly through graduate or undergraduate training is many times less than that reached through extension activities. For example, in the case of our school, we now have an alumni body in excess of 2,158 persons from our graduate and undergraduate programs; but in terms of our extension programs, we have an alumni group of many times that each year. In the last five years, more than 49,000 people were served by our extension programs.

The degree to which extension activities are seen as valuable and essential to practitioners, the degree to which they are seen as meaningful assistance in the process of problem-solving in industrial relations, and the degree to which they are seen as a contribution to finding solutions for the pressing community problems faced by all of us these days, determine the general support and whether a favorable climate is established for the total program of the industrial relations centers.

I would certainly not minimize the importance to the reputation of the centers of the quality of the faculty members, as teachers and as researchers and writers. I would submit, however, that generally speaking these aspects of the organization are known to a reasonably small group of individuals and play a limited role in gaining financial support and establishing general public backing and reputation for the center.

The public image is much more likely to come from extension activities. Practitioners participating in these activities come to know the center and may suggest it to their children or to friends' children as a place for study. Practitioners may turn to the industrial relations centers for recruiting because certain program undertakings suggested the center as a place to find qualified personnel for their organizations. To a great degree, the public image of a center may be damaged or enhanced by its extension activities.

Having described what seems to me to be the nature and role of extension in the industrial relations centers, let me mention three problems regarding these activities. First, the extension activities of an industrial relations center are likely to be on the firing line. Extension staff members are subject to various pressures either to engage in certain activities or program or to refrain from engaging in these activities. The question of the groups with whom they work, the bias which staff brings to a program, and the extent to which extension activities are focused on the important topics of the day are all matters which come within public scrutiny to a much greater degree than do research and resident teaching.

Should extension become involved in working with civil rights groups? Should courses be conducted for members of an organization seeking to unionize and gain collective bargaining rights? Should a program for management be conducted during a time when there is an industrial dispute or strike going on in the industry? These and an unlimited number of similar questions are continually involved in decisions regarding the direction and nature of the extension activities to be undertaken. It must be recognized by those who are in charge of extension, the industrial relations centers, and the universitites of which they are a part, that the academic freedom concept should be applied to extension programs. While the extension activities must, of course, be sensitive and responsive to the needs of the community and practitioners whom they serve, they must, at the same time, be protected from interference and domination by these forces. Drawing these distinctions in daily decisions is an important aspect of the responsibilities of extension staff.

This point of being on the firing line, together with the whole concept of the role and function of extension as I have visualized it, creates the second problem--that of the recruitment, staffing, and value system to be used in organizing and carrying on an extension program. As I have mentioned, extension activities have a variety of relationships with resident teaching and research. Just as each of these functions in the university have certain staff requirements which are imposed by their very nature, so does extension. It is important to recognize that the extension function calls for individuals who not only have competency and experience in the subject matter but also have the interest and ability to work effectively with practitioners. Such individuals in most instances are unlikely to be able at the same time to pursue a substantial amount of research or to be involved in the continuing on-campus resident-teaching process. Thus, in extension there are problems in determining appropriate criteria to be used for the selection and retention of individual staff members. These problems are not, of course, unique to the extension activities in industrial relations centers. They are, however, possibly more of an issue within the center because of the lack of tradition which may be found in other sectors and because there may be a conflict with the striving of center faculty for recognition and status within the university. For the moment, it is enough to point to the problem without attempting to define its solution.

A third problem is that of the freedom of extension staff in industrial relations centers to experiment in the development of program and teaching arrangements which do not necessarily parallel activities carried on in resident teaching programs. There should be an opportunity to experiment with methods and teaching techniques which may not be appropriate to resident teaching. Because of the diversity of the backgrounds and experiences of practitioners served by extension, prerequisites and time sequence of instruction should be flexible. In many instances, practical experience in the field and high motivation to learn are more than adequate substitutes for previous formal instruction.

The extension activities of the industrial relations centers, like most of continuing education, suffer from the concepts and techniques of education designed for youths but applied to adults. In too few instances, our university faculty members, including faculty members of industrial relations centers, are willing to see this familiar structure replaced by other approaches better adapted to adult learning.

There are, of course, other problems and strains between the extension function and those who serve it and their colleagues involved in resident instruction and research. Those faculty members, regardless of their primary responsibilities in the center, who are knowledgeable and broadly experienced in the field recognize the importance and interrelationship of the extension function and the resident teaching and research functions of the center. The growth of extension has proven its value not only to the participating practitioner and the organization he represents, but also to the educational institution. Association with practitioners provides the faculty members with continued opportunity to be abreast of the concerns and problems faced by the practitioner and thereby makes his teaching and research more pertinent to the field. For practitioners, the extension program of the centers provides a means of continuing education in their rapidly changing profession.

The need for continuing education is demonstrated by the growing pressures for expansion faced by the centers' extension programs. These pressures, together with a shortage of qualified personnel, makes it imperative that the centers continuously look for more efficient ways of meeting their obligations to the practitioners. They must also continue to search for ways to develop the appropriate balance between research, resident teaching, and extension.

Recently, U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe spoke at the annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors. He felt that "the extraordinary paradox" of higher education is that it seeks methods of "boldly reshaping the world outside of the campus gates while neglecting to make corresponding changes to the world within." The recent development of industrial relations centers and the growth of the field they seek to serve is an example of the university reshaping itself. It is essential that the spirit of experimentation and adventure which led to their formation and attracted their original faculty and students be perpetuated not only in extension activities but also in the rest of the centers' programs.

DISCUSSION

Ben Seligman
University of Massachusetts

Mr. Risley's paper is so comprehensive that the only observations a commentator can make hinge on matters of emphasis. In the main, I come away from his remarks with the impression that this is an area in which, to paraphrase the Italian playwright Pirandello, there are six institutions in search of a philosophy.

Perhaps this situation stems insofar as extension is concerned from the historical fact that we have had in this country not a labor movement, but rather a trade union movement concerned in the main with issues that seldom transcend the place of work. In the twentieth century, unions in the United States have not often stepped outside the boundaries of occupation. Consequently, it has remained for reformers, radicals, civil rights protagonists, and academicians to take up the cry of social change. Except for the 1930's, unions have entered the mainstream of reform only after a good deal of prodding, particularly by interested staff persons. The experience of a Solomon Barkin working on area redevelopment or a Nelson Cruikshank pressing for improvements in social security are rather rare. The unions have been preoccupied with the here and now.

It should come as no suprise, therefore, that institutions such as an industrial relations center or a labor institute seeking to provide services to the labor unions within its geographic compass would display the perceptions of its constituency. But does such a situation properly reflect the function of a university? My own bias suggests not. Since I view the problems Mr. Risley has cited as "on the priority agenda of the nation" as overriding for unions as well as for the rest of us, I should think that an extension service ought to pay primary attention to such urgencies. He raises the question whether we ought to become "involved in working with civil rights groups." This would seem to be a proper function for a labor center, if only to help clarify issues. Should a labor center involve itself in, say, the War on Poverty? Again, I would suggest an affirmative response: several university institutes have already done so, including the University of Massachusetts, serving as training locales to help trade unionists immerse themselves in the activity of community action programs.

The implicit assumption here is that the social urgenices for the next decade or so are to be discovered in the public sector--housing, education, urban redevelopment, resources, transportation, and the like. To be sure, trade union conventions will provide a full range of resolutions on these issues, as well as on poverty, consumer protection, equal rights, and an equitable tax system. One hardly quarrels with these eloquent statements. Such resolutions are repeated from convention to convention; their fulfillment often requires more effort than the top strata of union officialdom are prepared to expend.

It is at this juncture that the academic world can offer a modest contribution. Labor centers can provide meaningful explorations of all of these issues not only through workshops and conferences as Mr. Risley suggests, but also through their respective programs of short courses as well.

If indeed our labor centers are to evolve a "common program," it would seem to me that such a program can be achieved by the recognition of significant social directions and by their energetic pursuit. None of this should displace the traditional activities city by Mr. Risley. Steward training, grievance handling, collective bargaining, and time and motion study are standard fare; these are the tool subjects that comprise the core of a labor center's activities. The teaching techniques described in Mr. Risley's paper all are valid methods for conveying information and generating comprehension of the complex problems and issues that are involved in these matters. But we need to exercise an intellectual audacity that will provide a stimulus to our constituency: they need to acknowledge that today's pressing issues transcend the arguments that a worker has with his foreman.

A second point on which I should like to dwell for a few moments stems from the paper's observations on the research and academic functions of a center. I agree completely with Mr. Risley that the extension function must be closely related to research and resident teaching functions. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. A recent tabulation prepared by the University Labor Education Association showed that not more than a half dozen universities sponsoring labor centers allow fully integrated programs, that is, programs that include teaching, research, and extension under a single academic umbrella. In some universities one finds the formal academic training program plus research, but not extension. In most, there will be extension but no degree program.

Such a situation reflects a pattern of uneven development across the country and does make it difficult for our field, which is in process of evolution, to attain the sort of maturity that so many feel is desirable. One hopes that those who are in extension almost exclusively will press for complementary academic programs, as did Herbert Levine at Rutgers. For if we consider the relationships that Mr. Risley speaks of as worthwhile, and I think they are, there needs to be a structure with elements that can be integrated and related to each other. A bridge cannot be constructed if the bank on the other side is too far away.

The sort of research activities Mr. Risley describes are all useful, but here one often faces another problem: our academic colleagues are often uninterested in the nitty gritty of investigations in such pragmatic areas as workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, or labor standards. They frequently prefer the theoretical, behavioral research problem, the sort of question that seems to a center constituency to pose queries unrelated to its own experience. Translating such research is no easy task, and often there are more immediate issues at hand. Such a situation frequently requires delicate handling at administrative levels and may even occasion some internal restructuring as at the University of California in Berkeley, where it was found necessary to provide a research capability directly in the extension program. A similar solution was adopted at my own institution.

At the academic level, Mr. Risley suggests that extension functions may provide graduate students with subjects for thesis studies. This is not enough. Full integration with extension demands more than providing students with topics for research. A mechanism needs to be employed that will expose students to the thought and needs of practitioners. Such a mechanism may take the form of internships or field work. This does not imply that graduate students engage directly in extension, but rather that they be afforded the opportunity of observing such activity and even partaking of the experience under the guidance of an extension specialist. Mr. Risely at best would make such work voluntary or as part of a formal course. I would suggest that it be a formal requirement, with sufficient time allotted for its fulfillment.

These then are my major comments on the paper. Extension activity needs a clearer perspective of both function and direction, an objective that can be reached best when it partakes of university purpose on a equal footing with academic work and research, not as a secondary pursuit.

Frederic Meyers
University of California at Los Angeles

I think Mr. Risley's paper fairly describes the diversity of activities carried on in "extension" programs of industrial relations centers in United States universities and some of the problems of relations of these activities to the universities in which the centers are located.

Rather than to deal with the detail of his excellent paper, I should like to use my time to supplement it with a brief mention of two sides of the problem not extensively dealt with in his paper. That is the question of the division of function between the university and the clients of extension activities of the centers--usually organized labor and management. The problem is: Who should do what in the training or education of this clientele? Mr. Risley has concerned himself principally with university-centered problems. This question deals with client-centered problems.

A second problem I should like to touch on, which is only alluded to in Mr. Risley's paper, is the one of the consultative role of the center.

As most of us who have been concerned with trade union education in university industrial relations centers are aware, the attitudes among United States trade unions toward our appropriate role varies over a rather wide spectrum. At one end are unions which consider education of their members essentially a union function, in which external agencies, universities included, are to play a minor role, if indeed they are to play any role at all. These attitudes derive, for some, from a concept of the union as the central institution in the life of the member. Hence, the union should not only train its own leadership personnel, but should provide broader educational services to members as part of the design to center the member's life, and that of his family, around the union institution. For other unions (and for some a mix of the two motives), there remains a distrust of the university as part of the establishment, seen either as anti-union or as attempting to preserve established institutions and to constrict the union to too narrow and conservative a role.

At the other end are unions which see an obligation on the part of the state to provide trade unions with the same range of services, free of charge, they see as being provided other interest groups in society. But these unions would often like to "own" or exercise a high degree of control over the labor extension service. In public universities, services are sought analogous to agricultural extension and research and to schools of business administration and their extension services.

There are analogous attitudes on the part of management clients, although the first extreme is possibly less pronounced. But there are managements who mistrust universities and who share in the sort of German mystique that management cannot be taught; only the morality of management can be inculcated and reinforced, and that by those who are really managerial elites. Such managements often are willing to accept participation in the process from schools of business administration regarded as extensions of management (which the modern school of business administration would deny), and not from institutes of industrial relations serving management and trade union clienteles.

These attitudes affect the role and structure of the institutes, so far as their extension activities are concerned. The first type of union is more willing to allow participation of an institute which they see as some sort of extension of the trade union movement. But when they do, they demand extensive control over offerings, personnel, and all other aspects of the program. Often they prefer to allow participation of individuals, rather than that of the institution. To a somewhat less pronounced degree do unions at the other end of the spectrum seek similar controls, at least where what are regarded as pure "trade union" subjects are concerned--less so if the programs are general educational and cultural ones.

As Mr. Risley has pointed out, our United States institutes are constrained in a number of ways by the fact of their location in a university structure. Perhaps for historical reasons, our universities are more willing to accept the notion that an agricultural extension may simply serve a clientele; they are less willing to do this with respect to trade unions. Therefore, they tend to look with suspicion on purely client-centered activity and to resist a high degree of client control. Hence there develops the conflict between the values of the university and the nature and form of the services expected by the clientele--themselves ranging over a considerable spectrum.

This conflict is even more pronounce when it comes to the possible consultative role to be played by the institute. Most people would agree that personnel of an institute ought not, in their institute roles, intervene in specific union-management conflicts, though in the guise of getting access to a research locus we often assist in the solution of problems quite specific to a particular business. But when it comes to developing general policies or strategies, we do often serve, in effect, as consultants, either informally or through the organization of short conferences on specific topics. I think for example, in my own experience, of the highly stimulating role our institute at the University of California, Los Angeles, has played in the development of collectively bargained health and welfare programs, which I believe would not be so advanced on the West Coast if it had not been for this activity. Such activities are still in the range of controversy as to their appropriateness in a university. Further, the university ethic is, I believe, more demanding as to the role of institute personnel as individuals than it is for many others. Even personnel wholly involved in trade union education are more constrained from representing a union, on their own time, as a paid consultant to a union than are, for example, personnel involved wholly in management education for a particular management.

These are, I think, significant problems. That they are not at the center of Mr. Risley's paper is indicative of the relative progress that has been made in this country. Building on the tradition of service to interest groups such as agriculture and business, we have been able to accept, though with some greater constraints, service to trade unions and to managements in the sensitive area of industrial relations.

The fact that our activity in the United States is of greater extent than that in most other countries is not solely the result of our affluence. After all, our trade unions are also more affluent than are foreign movements, and hence better able to provide these services for themselves, as some of them still prefer to do. But in many foreign countries, the university is regarded by the trade union movement as representative of a social system which the trade union movement seeks to change, and by management either as the haven of impractical men or as in principle anti-business. This is, as a generalization, characteristic of France, where union-university cooperation in education is rare (though not unknown), despite a recent spate of legislation and collective agreements which provide, in principle, paid leaves for worker representatives for educational purposes. Though institutes for management education using the extension style, not limited to but including industrial relations, now exist in ten French universities, their acceptance is slow and activity in industrial relations minimal. The idea of a single institute which would serve both management and trade union personnel would, I think, be almost wholly unacceptable.

In Britain, on the other hand, where universities are regarded with less suspicion by the parties at interest and where a higher degree of mutual acceptance has been achieved between the parties themselves, extra-mural departments of universities have long been engaged in education in the field of industrial relations.

I hope these comments may serve to stimulate discussion which runs along lines of the problems of client relations of extension activities of industrial relations centers, and the relation of those problems to the university community in which the center finds itself and the view of the clientele of the role of the university and of its own role in society. Such a discussion may serve, in an international gathering such as this, to put the specific description of program in a context which has meaning to the broader international community. In the time here allotted to me I can do no more than raise the issues.

Ronald Peters
Roosevelt University

I find Mr. Risley's coverage of industrial relations centers' extension activities and problems a good one and I can take little issue with the points he makes. In the light of my experience over the past few years in labor education and manpower training, I wish to reflect on three points made in this presentation.

The first is in the area of publication services where centers are providing information and research reports to practitioners. Often research report are academic in nature and unreadable by the average union leader. Recently I have been establishing preretirement education programs with some local unions. These programs are planned with the local's education chairman. In my search for materials in this area, I cameacross a reprint put out by a mid-western industrial relations center. This reprint was entitled "Mobility and Situational Factors in the Adjustment of Older Workers to Job Displacement." As creditable a piece of research as this is, I, as a practitioner, find it of little use in my efforts to document the problems of older workers to these union education chairmen. Therefore, the industrial relations center's role of "translator" of meaningful research into laymen's language is indeed a valid one and one that needs expanding.

A second area is that of the industrial relations center's flexibility in meeting new social challenges. In recent years, centers have been increasing their formal education requirements, thus disqualifying large numbers of otherwise qualified people who could relate to deprivation, unemployment, and the many other complex social problems surrounding the culture of poverty.

In the field of university labor education there has been only one Negro placed in a full-time position among the 25 universities engaged in this activity despite the increases in Negro trade union membership and Negro leadership.

The third area is that of the industrial relations centers' providing an arena for idea exchanges. Mr. Risley mentioned a setting for an exchange between academician and practitioner; I shall extend that to providing an exchange between various practitioners.

In recent months, our division has been engaged in the evaluation of a training program for the hard-core unemployed. The program provided 30 weeks of basic and prevocational education along with counseling, job placement, and on-the-job counseling for 800 hard-core unemployed in Chicago. Over the past few weeks I have been interviewing personnel directors of firms employing the graduates of the program. It is interesting to note the differences in performance expectations between the personnel managers and the counselors at the training centers who had worked with the trainees throughout the institutional phase of the program. The counselors had tutored many of the trainees through one or another crisis (legal, criminal, financial) over the weeks and witnessed the trainees' development from near societal dropouts into workers capable of performing entry level jobs in industry. On the other hand, the personnel director's expectations of the trainees did not take into account the special problems of deprivation they had to overcome. If somehow there could be more communication between the personnel managers and the training centers, the performance of the trainees could be more consistent. With business now addressing itself more to the problem of job training, an industrial relations center could provide an arena for continuing exchanges among personnel at all levels in the government agencies and firms who have mobilized to focus on this problem.

Mr. Risley's conclusion is an apt one--that the spirit of experimentation and innovation, which led to the founding of industrial relations centers, be continued to meet the changing needs of the industrial relations area.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Martin Wagner, Chairman

CHANGING PATTERNS OF RESEARCH IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS*

Milton Derber
University of Illinois

Earlier Surveys

In December, 1962, Gerald Somers and I presented separate papers to the Industrial Relations Research Association annual meeting describing and analyzing the postwar trend in research in the field of labor and industrial relations. Although we used somewhat different sources of information, our findings were very similar. Perhaps the chief conclusion was that research tended to follow the headlines--that the interest of researchers appeared to shift frequently with the shift in the practical problems of the time and with the availability of government and foundation funds.

To focus research on timely problems is certainly not a heinous matter in an academic discipline which, from its inception has regarded itself as a policy science and has constantly attempted not only to advance knowledge about the field but to contribute to the solution of the problems in both the private and public sectors. One need merely point to our great pioneers--the Webbs in Britain and Commons and associates at Wisconsin--to illustrate the long and distinguished tradition which has been established.

Nonetheless, as Mr. Somers put it so well:

> If industrial relations research is to play a more influential role in policy formation, the researcher must break his connection with the ephemeral happenings of the day. Long-range research projects, based on carefully formulated theoretical propositions, will be more productive of useful policy recommendations when such recommendations are required than a tilting at the windmills of passing fancy. Usefully applied industrial relations cannot spring full blown out of a vacuum of desire to influence policy. It must stem from basic, long-term research into continuing industrial relations phenomena.[1]

My paper expressed an additional concern, pertaining to methodology. It was that industrial relations students had not devoted as much attention as they might have to the application, if not the creation, of new methodological ideas. If a field of study is to warrant academic esteem as a discipline or as an area of specialization, its practitioners, I believe, must display some imagination and boldness in methodological as well as theoretical ways.

---

*I wish to express my appreciation to John Felice for his excellent assistance in the gathering of data for this paper.

[1] Industrial Relations Research Association, Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, December 27-28, 1962, p. 115.

The present paper was prepared with the foregoing considerations in mind. The time available from the date of the invitation to contribute the paper to the date when submission was expected did not allow a study in depth. As a short-cut to what I hope will be a representative inspection of the field, I have concentrated on fifteen industrial relations centers, institutes, and schools which have been active sponsors of research.[2] My research assistant and I carefully examined the reports which these institutions have submitted annually or biennially to the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, at Cornell, going back to 1956. We classified the projects under 15 headings, encompassing virtually every important aspect of the field, and then analyzed comparatively the numbers of projects mentioned in each of three four-year periods: 1956-59, 1960-63, and 1964-67.

The limitations and defects of this approach are painfully obvious. Projects vary enormously in size and scope. Not all projects reported get completed. The same project may be reported in different form over a number of years, although we eliminated duplication wherever possible. What is sometimes reported as research is often a "think piece" or a highly impressionistic essay. Some of the reports are so elliptical and that it is not always clear what the project is really about. Nevertheless, despite these and other weaknesses, I think that the findings are useful for our purpose since we need attach no importance to the absolute numbers[3] but rather focus on the comparative distributions over the three time periods. The character of the reports did not seem to change over time. I am also relying, as a partial check, on my personal familiarity with many of the researchers and the more important projects throughout the past two decades.

The Change in Subject Matter Continues

The general conclusion, which will come as no surprise, is that the pattern of shifting research interests and emphases has continued (see Table I). In the 1956-59 period, the leading area investigated was management organization (18.6 percent), closely followed by foreign and international studies (17.3 percent). Some distance behind, four other subjects were clustered--labor organization and

---

[2] Cornell, California (Berkeley), California (Los Angeles), Chicago, Illinois, Michigan, Michigan State, Michigan-Wayne, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Minnesota, New York University, Princeton, Rutgers, Wisconsin, and Yale.

[3] For whatever they may be worth, the absolute numbers were 388, 409, and 301 in the three periods respectively. The large drop in the third period is due to fewer reports from several institutions as well as to some decline in research activity among the sample institutions. I estimate that about 60 percent of the drop is due to the former reason and 40 percent to the latter.

Table I

Research Projects Reported by Fifteen Industrial Relations Centers

Projects	1956-59	1960-63	1964-67
	Percentage Distribution by Period		
Management organization and communications	18.6	13.2	10.3
Foreign and international studies	17.3	15.7	18.9
Labor organization and history	11.1	11.7	9.3
Union-management relations in private industry	10.6	11.3	4.3
The labor market	9.0	11.3	18.3
Wages and fringes	8.5	4.4	3.0
Labor law and administration	6.7	4.4	3.3
Health and safety	4.4	3.9	2.7
Older workers and retirement	3.4	4.9	2.7
Methodological problems	2.8	1.2	3.0
Unemployment and poverty	2.6	3.9	8.3
Technological change	2.3	5.9	2.3
Public employee relations	.8	1.7	3.3
Race relations	.5	1.5	5.7
Miscellaneous	1.6	5.1	4.7
	100.2	100.1	100.1

Source: Reports in various issues of Industrial and Labor Relations Review.

history (11.1 percent), union-management relations in the private sector (10.6 percent), the labor market, excluding the problems of older workers (9.0 percent), and wages and fringes (8.5 percent). The remaining quarter of the studies were spread among nine areas, with only labor law exceeding 5 percent.

In the second period, 1960-63, the top five categories of the preceding period were still dominant, with only a slightly changed order. Foreign and international studies now comprised the single largest category (15.7 percent) with management organization and communications next(13.2 percent), and labor organization and history (11.7 percent), union-management relations in the private sector (11.3 percent) and the labor market (11.3 percent) close behind. The interest in the wage area, however, had fallen appreciably--to 4.4 percent. These six categories encompassed 69 percent of the studies recorded compared to 75 percent in the earlier period. The remaining third of the studies were distributed among nine categories, the largest of which--technological change--represented only 6 percent. Not only did the centers fail to get excited about technological change problems, which one would be inclined to regard as of great long-range importance, but they lagged badly in areas which were soon to make the headlines--race relations and public employee relations.

In the third and most recent period, 1964-67, the shift which we might have expected from impressionistic observations became visible. The labor market area attracted 18.3 percent of the studies and the closely related category of unemployment and poverty jumped from 2.6 percent in 1956-59 to 8.3 percent. Together they represented 26.6 percent of the total. The international area continued to attract strong attention with a rise to 18.9 percent--further support for American participation in the International Industrial Relations Association. The top six categories contained 81 percent of the reported studies--a greater concentration than in either of the two preceding periods. It was not surprising that race relations and public employee relations advanced in popularity, but it was surprising that the proportions continued to be low--5.7 percent and 3.3 percent respectively. What is even more surprising is that the technological change area declined to 2.3 percent. On the other hand, the declines in the rest of the areas were in accord with expectations: management organization and communications to 10.3 percent; labor organization and history to 9.3 percent; union-management relations in the private sector, very sharply, to 4.3 percent; and wages and fringes still further to 3 percent. The labor law category, at 3.3 percent, was less than half of what it had been in 1956-59.

These changes in the research interests of the industrial relations centers do not necessarily reflect an over-all national pattern. Labor history, for example, is engaging the attention of many American historians who, prior to the last decade, had largely left the field to the labor institutionalists. The Labor Historians' Association is an organization of some vigor, its members are the chief contributors to Labor History, and its annual meetings are linked, not to the Industrial Relations Research Association, but to the American Historical Association.

Similarly the area of management organization and communications is the focal point of interest among behavioral scientists and industrial administration specialists. Their organizations, like the Academy of Management, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, and The Institute of Management Sciences, and their publications, like Administrative Science Quarterly, Academy of Management Journal, Behavioral Science, Human Relations, Journal of Conflict Resolution, and the Journal of Social Issues, are thriving. In the fields of law and technology a good deal of research is also being conducted outside of the orbits of the centers, and I suspect--without being able to provide any reliable data--that the trend is opposite to what my statistics indicate.

The Methodological Condition

The proportion of studies devoted to research methodology by the faculties of the industrial relations centers has remained at a virtual plateau through the 12 years, being 2.8 percent in 1956-59, down to 1.2 percent in 1960-63, and up again to 3.0 percent in 1964-67. These figures seem consistent with the patterns in earlier years. Viewing industrial relations as an applied field, the researchers appear to be content to rely on techniques and designs developed in the underlying disciplines of economics, psychology, sociology, and statistics.

The shift in subject matter, however, has almost certainly resulted in a shift in the relative utilization of different techniques although this cannot be expressed in percentage terms from the available data. With the greatly increased attention to manpower problems, the reliance on multiple regression analysis techniques, for example, has sharply increased, and one would be well advised to update his familiarity with these and related statistical tools (if not the underlying mathematics) to be at home with the literature. Cost-benefit studies, derived from other branches of economics, have likewise encouraged the use of mathematical and statistical models.

Concurrently there appears to be a decline in the use of the case study, which was once probably the most common of the research designs in use, particularly in the area of labor organizations and union-management relations. If research in public employee relations gets the attention which it deserves, increased use of the case design can be expected.

Because of my special bias in favor of interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary research, I scanned the data on this core with some care. A number of important projects involved more than one researcher (not including student assistants), but most of the groups seemed to be comprised of people from the same or closely related disciplinary backgrounds--labor economics, political science-law, or social psychology (i.e., behavioral science). One device to cope with cross-disciplinary problems, used for example in two major Berkeley projects--on the aged and on labor in economic development--was to "farm out" certain segments of the project to specialists with different disciplinary backgrounds from the project leaders. If anything, interdisciplinary teams seemed to be less common than in the first postwar decade. On the other hand, broadly trained industrial relations students (either of the old economic institutionalist vintage or with the new industrial relations Ph.D. background) continued to deal with problems of an interdisciplinary character undaunted by the hazards of moving into the territory of more narrowly and intensively trained specialists.

Some Concluding Observations and Questions

This obviously incomplete and imprecise survey suggests several interesting comments and questions--some similar to those of the earlier surveys, some rather different.

(1) Once again it may be asked whether the legitimate concern over policy issues has not obscured the importance of long-range research designed to establish a solid foundation of principles and facts for application to future problems. Why have we been so delinquent or short-sighted in the areas of race relations and public employee relations? Why were we so poorly prepared for the manpower problems of the sixties? Why are we lagging in the technology area?

(2) The concentration of research on a relatively few topics (70 to 80 percent in six of fifteen categories) suggests either that the centers are short-changing important areas of the field or are inadequately financed to cover their jurisdiction. Is there a danger that important segments of the field may be largely "taken over" by more specialized institutions? I raise this question not out of a narrow mentality of job-consciousness but rather with an eye to the implications of self-limitation for the long-run contributions of the centers to teaching as well as to the construction of an integrated body of principles and facts. Correlatively, should we not be demonstrating more concern about building bridges to the labor historians, the behavioral scientists, the lawyers, the political scientists, and others who are making significant research and theoretical contributions on problems within our field?

(3) I come finally to an old bone of contention. In a field whose problems are, to a considerable degree, interdisciplinary, are the centers designing and organizing their research in keeping with the characteristics of the problems? Is there an adequate representation of the relevant disciplines in the centers, and are those disciplines which are represented being most effectively utilized? I am increasingly inclined to the conclusion that the answer lies in the training of interdisciplinary researchers rather than in the development of interdisciplinary teams.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RESEARCH[1]

Herbert G. Heneman, Jr.
University of Minnesota

The twentieth century is the century of the knowledge explosion. The two most important disciplines of the first half of this century were mathematics and physics; beyond reasonable doubt industrial relations is the most important discipline of the second half.[2] This is the era of change--and of speed-up in the rate of change. In industrialized countries the employment standard has replaced the gold standard. It is through employment that we effectuate most of the improvements in our living standards, e.g., better health, better education, and more goods and services. With accelerated change has come increased complexity of employment behaviors. Technology is the most obvious determinant of new forms of employment behavior. The miracles of technology have made it possible for the masses to be humanized--to realistically aspire to and realize, higher values than subsistence. But the miracle of technology has also been accompanied by such compelling forces as urbanization, affluence, higher levels of education, increased specialization and dependency, the population explosion, intensified racial problems, and changing values. Our lives are largely products of our employment behaviors; both are exceedingly complex and are becoming more so every day. The true significance of the new discipline of industrial relations may lie in its failure rather than in its success. The urgency, range, number, and severity of employment problems seem to be increasing rapidly. Can the volume, and especially the quality, of industrial relations research contributions provide solutions? Can employment be made effective, efficient, and satisfying? Can it be sufficiently flexible and adaptable?

It is difficult to assess the contributions of industrial relations research for a variety of reasons. First, there is no single catalogue or listing for industrial relations such as the Annual Review of Psychology and the Review of Medicine. There is a terrible communications gap among industrial relations researchers, and between researchers and users of research.[3] Second, not only is the literature fragmented among many disciplines, but it is of dubious quality; much if not most of it is descriptive, prescriptive, poorly designed, and generally worthless. We should change the name of the Industrial Relations Research Association to the Industrial Relations Association for we have all but forgotten research. Our volumes on special topics and our proceedings are long on exhortation and short on measurement, research design, experimentation, and hard data. At best a hoped-for interdisciplinary research association is rapidly becoming a floating rest home for academic labor economists and bureaucrats seeking respectability. It is no credit to the IRRA that we feel our guilt sufficiently so that we seek catharsis and expiation in an occasional so-called "research" volume. Third, the scope and complexity of substance and method represent a challenge beyond the scope of most would be reviewers--and especially this one. Fourth, it is quite impractical to confine such review to contributions of those in university industrial relations centers; the range in sources is almost unlimited.

---

[1] I am indebted to my colleagues Marvin D. Dunnette, George W. England, Edward Gross, Sookon Kim, Thomas A. Mahoney, John G. Turnbull, William Weitzel, and Mahmood A. Zaidi for valuable suggestions.

[2] I define industrial relations as all aspects of employment behavior. Others may prefer terms such as "human resources," "employment relations," "manpower science," labor, organizational psychology, and many others. A discipline is defined by its dependent variables. The purpose of a discipline is to explain variations in dependent variables. A discipline: (1) provides knowledge and understanding per se, (2) facilitiates and makes workable operational systems to attain outcomes, (3) guides and tests policy, and (4) prevents and ameliorates problems.

At first glance, the most appropriate answer to the question, "What is the significance of recent contributions to industrial relations research?" might appear to be: "Not much!" There is substantial cultural lag. Thus, for example, compare Paul Webbink (1945), Cecil Goode (1958), and Milton Derber (1967).[4] The first meeting of industrial relations centers was arranged by, and held at, the University of Minnesota in 1945. Paul Webbink of the Social Science Research Council stressed the need for well-designed studies, additive and replicated through time. Goode recognizes similar deficiencies. Derber decries the tenuous and limited linkage of theory and research, the plethora of surveys, and "following the headlines" (availability of funds) to superficial results. We still have many of the same old methodological and conceptual problems.[5] We wallow in the limits and excesses of our various "old-time" disciplines. As Faust spoke:

---

[3] For a quick overview, however, see in toto: John T. Cowles, "Recent Personnel Research in the Academic World," in A. L. Fortuna (ed.), Personnel Research and Systems Advancement (Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Personnel Research Laboratory (PRL-TF-67-13), December 1967), pp. 1-11; Milton Derber, Research in Labor Problems in the United States (New York: Random House, 1967); Edward Gross, Industry and Social Life (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1965). These represent principally psychological, labor economics, and sociological viewpoints.

[4] Paul Webbink, "Priorities in Research," in Training and Research in Industrial Relations, Bulletin 1 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, 1945), pp. 45-49; Cecil E. Goode, Personnel Research Frontiers (Chicago: Public Personnel Association, 1958); Milton Derber, Research in Labor . . . , pp. 142-43. See also Dale Yoder, H. G. Heneman Jr., and Earl F. Cheit, "Triple Audit of Industrial Relations" (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, August, 1951), pp. 1-12.

> "Here stand I, ach Philosophy
> Behind me and Law and Medicine too
> And to my cost, Theology --
> All these I have sweated through and through
> And now you see me a poor fool
> As wiseas when I entered school!"[6]

A deeper look at the consequences of industrial relations research, however, suggests that we are making more headway than might be apparent on the surface. Let us look at five areas in more detail: (1) effects on policy and practice, (2) increased knowledge and understanding, (3) improvements in methodology, (4) urgent research needs, and (5) improvements in graduate training.

Effects on Policy and Practice

"If you build a good enough mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door." Hard evidence is lacking on the amount spent for industrial relations research. Cecil Goode estimated that in 1957 about 1 percent of total research funds in the United States were spent for "human relations" research. About one-half of this was spent for "personnel" research.[7] In 1968, we plan to spend $26.5 billion on research (in contrast to $7 billion in 1957) and 4 percent will be spent by the social sciences.[8] Apparently we are spending more for industrial relations research, but proportionately and absolutely not anywhere near enough for our needs. Thus, we are forced by our ignorance and penuriousness to a policy of amelioration rather than prevention through application of basic knowledge.

---

[5] As an example of conceptual lag: Dale Yoder and H. G. Heneman, Jr. stressed the concept of "underemployment" in Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Manpower Blueprint for a Free Economy, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 26-28. Ten years later the concept began to spark some interest in the epic first Manpower Report of the President. Was this a cultural lag? Consider the words of Socrates: "I call that man idle who might be better employed."

[6] The fractured and fractious approaches of the several older disciplines may be illustrated by some psychologists who perhaps deserve credit for their emphasis upon measurement but who often fritter away their efforts in over-refinement while measuring trivia. Or take labor economists who impose ex post facto research designes upon available data of dubious quality from many sources unrelated to their "study." In general, we are victims of our models; we seldom seem to recognize their restraints upon our conceptual outcomes. We need new, more flexible, more realistic models that cut across "old disciplines." The situation is compounded further by the drive for "purity" within each of the older, nobler disciplines. In economics, e.g., the "in group" of would be econometricians, second rate mathematicians who pursue their formulas, loftily cast aside institutionalists and other lower order persons who admit to interests in real life. A similar situation exists in psychology, sociology, political science, etc. This situation alone (as well as the superiority of a common approach is a most compelling argument for the discipline of industrial relations!

Another line of evidence might be the increased volume of publications in the industrial relations field, including several excellent new journals. This, again, is not of much positive significance. Readerships, or rather subscriptions are terribly small; 4,000 is a big publication run. The horrendous increase in quantity and lack of quality suggest two major possibilities: (1) "publish or perish" edicts rather than contributions of industrial relations research are responsible for the cancerous growth, and (2) we should not publish these journals on a regular basis--only when we have sufficient articles of sufficient quality to warrant publication.

Another line of evidence might be actual attempts by industry to use research as an arm of policy in industrial relations. Again the message rings loud, clear, and negative--no sale! Take for examples, the Human Relations Committee of the steel industry and the Armour Automation Fund experiences.[9]

A study by Dunnette and Brown of the University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center provides additional disconcerting evidence.[10] The "most significant" recent articles and books (as judged by a panel of 45 men active in behavioral science research and practice) formed the basis for a questionnaire sent to 200 business executives. The most significant finding was the small proportion who had even heard of the major contributions. An only one-fifth said that one or more of these contributions had significantly influenced conduct of their firm's business. Dunnette and Brown suggest a difference in value orientation as a possible explanation--the researchers overly imbued with instrumentation, and the executives not interested in research not directly relevant to real life problems. Thus, Dunnette and Brown argue that every research study should have dual publication, in a technical journal and in a nontechnical journal. I would argue that one publication might do the job better, in two parts if necessary.

---

[7] Cecil Goode, Personnel Research Frontiers, pp. 118-19.

[8] "Research Outlook," Business Week, February 3, 1968, p. 73.

[9] Cf. James J. Healy (ed.), Creative Collective Bargaining (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965). A very limited survey reports that about one-third of (20 of 83) largest U.S. corporations do not engage in industrial relations research. See Max S. Wortman, Jr., "Corporate Industrial Relations Research--Dream or Reality?" Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 9, No. 2, June 1966, pp. 127-35.

[10] M. D. Dunnette and Z. M. Brown, "Behavioral Science Research and the Conduct of Business," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. II, No. 1, June 1968, pp. 172-78. Some of those with "most significant contributions" in their study include Drucker, Argyris, Whyte, Haire, Skinner, Herzberg, Leavitt, Sayles, Festinger, Adams, and others. It is notable that an "interpreter," Drucker, leads the recognition list.

In fact, I strongly urge the IRRA and the various centers to publish an annual volume called the *Annual Review of Industrial Relations* to parallel the *Annual Review of Psychology*. The task could be rotated among the major industrial relations centers to share the burden. Only several dozen pages might be needed at first; hopefully the reviews could appraise not only substantive and technical contributions, but operational potential as well. We can plan to make research contributions usable--the *Annual Review* could function as an "interpreter."

Industrial relations research in industry is not completely dead, however. Several major companies (e.g., General Electric, Sears, A.T. & T., Standard Oil, Texas Instruments, Hewlett-Packard, etc.) are doing really good work. Unfortunately, in many companies such research is regarded with a proprietary stance, i.e., as a trade secret. Thus, much of its potential contribution is frustrated.

In unions, what little "research" is being done is charitably described as operational or programmatic; in general, it is essentially partisan and supportive of predetermined positions. Industrial relations research has little impact on union policy; many union leaders are scornful, and many would-be researchers (intellecutuals) have left the fold, at least in part because they did not agree with the leadership on the value of contributions of industrial relations research.

It is in the realm of public policy that we find a more hopeful possibility of industrial relations research contributions. Surely, the most significant industrial relations publication of the 1960's has been the *President's Manpower Report* (1963). This(and subsequent volumes) has inspired much industrial relations research. Indeed, it has firmly (an often too firmly) made research the handmainden of policy. Political compasses and research handouts dictate and distort the nature and direction of research. Gamesmanship (landing contracts) on the campus and among federal agencies has become a vital end per se; research is too often a pawn. The so-called "old-line" agencies still survey us to death, appear scared to death to build around theory and research design (despite having many very talented researchers), and seemingly manage to keep their noses unbloddied by their superiors or the public. A wee bit of research has come out of OMPER and similar "new" agencies, but it is forced by congressional and executive mandate to be essentially nonbasic, short-run (fiscal year) in focus.[11]

Improved Knowledge and Understanding

A second major yardstick of the contribution of industrial relations research is its impact upon knowledge and understanding; this is probably the most important single yardstick. In this area, there is a much more satisfactory result to date. For convenience I shall combine substantive and methodological contributions (to follow immediately below). Only selected major contributions are noted. No attempt is made at completeness and many significant contributions cannot be treated because of space limitations; I have made critical value judgments as to what contributions are most significant and where more emphasis is needed.[12]

The Substantive Payoffs!

In the decade of the 1960's, I would list the following as the most significant and influential substantive contributions of industrial relations research (in order from most to least):

1. The vast output on organization theories, including concepts of organizational effectiveness.
2. Human assets concepts, including education as an investment.

---

[11] Cf. My list of significant research contributions that follows below includes few from government per se. In the "sciences," government contributions are prominent. For some of the better examples of government sponsored industrial relations research, see Manpower Research Projects (through June 30, 1967) sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, September 1967; and A. L. Fortuna (ed.), Personnel Research and . . . .

[12] For a provocative evaluative article, see M. D. Dunnette and B. M. Bass, "Behavioral Scientists and Personnel Management," Industrial Relations, II:3, May 1963, pp. 115-30. In a somewhat similar philosophical vein see H. G. Heneman Jr., "Manpower Management: New Wrappings on Old Merchandise," Special Release 2 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, 1960).

3. Emergence of broader concepts of employment motivation, including personal values of workers.
4. Adoption of conceptual systems concepts, leading to more use of models, multiple variable comparisons and abstraction.
5. Improved models for decision making in employment, with emphasis upon specific outcomes rather than global criteria, and improved concepts of validities.
6. Renewed attacks on causes and cures of structural unemployment.
7. The emergence of long-run manpower planning at the micro level, essentially in the private sector.
8. Phillips curve type trade-offs of unemployment and price stability.
9. International manpower comparisons.[13]

Most Urgent Research Needs

Areas of urgency in research needs include: (again, in descending order from most to least)

1. Processes of manpower/employment goal formulation, and determination and integration of our actual goals (both macro and micro).
2. Renewed emphasis upon integration and systematization of theories to provide conceptual synthesis and paradigms.
3. Studies of adaptability of the human organism in employment, in a world that accelerates manpower obsolescence.
4. Studies of flexible job families and career patterns.
5. Improved manpower forecasting, including better labor demand theories.
6. Development and evaluation of learning and training theories to fill the current fantastic void.
7. Depth studies of the disadvantaged, including relations of employment adjustment in other areas of their lives.
8. Sophisticated studies of collective bargaining, including national emergency disputes, coalition bargaining, and bargaining for public and professional employees (i.e., improved conflict theory).
9. Integration of economic security systems, including private and public, income and welfare programs as related to employment.[14]

---

[13] Appendix A, available from the University of Minnesota in mimeo form.

[14] Appendix B, available from the University of Minnesota in mimeo form.

Improvements in Graduate Training

The contributions of the industrial relations centers to research have been of inestimable importance.[15] They have the advantage of bringing together scholars with a common focus and yet diverse interests. They facilitate interchange of ideas. Above all, they train graduate students in research. The greatest research contribution of all is the development of this "new breed of cat," the industrial relations scientist. The past and present generation has been largely single-discipline trained, occasionally inter-disciplinary oriented. The generation of Ph.D.'s coming out now should be far superior to their mentors, better equipped both substantively and methodologically. They are our great hope--they will "shape-up" our discipline.

Conclusion

This brief overview of research accomplishments, contributions, and needs is obviously grossly inadequate. It leaves out contributions of countries other than the United States, not because they are unimportant but because of my own inadequacies. Since others have similar difficulties, it strongly suggests that we have an urgent need to collate and synthesize our international research results. It argues eloquently for the expansion of the International Industrial Relations Association.

A second impression from this overview is the variety and complexity of studies, variables and relationships. We urgently need a paradigm. We need synthesis and abstraction. We need to systematize. There is now a fairly substantial literature on four major types of systems: (1) conceptual, (2) decision-making, (3) living systems, and (4) operational.[16] These need to be related and integrated. But first priority should go to the development of a common conceptual system--a paradigm. The effectiveness of decision systems, for example, is largely determined by adequacy or conceptual system underpining. My plea is not just for more venture into epistemology at this stage. Instead, I plead for specification of specific variables and relationships in the industrial relations paradigm. The greatest contribution of industrial relations research should not be "more" research, but "better" research. This requires synthesis and abstraction--a conceptual system. We urgently need a more common framework for research! I would venture a few recommendations in that regard.[17]

---

[15] Cf. "Twenty Years of Research," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 20:4, July 1967, pp. 722-40.

[16] Basic examples would include: H. G. Heneman, Jr. and Dale Yoder, Labor Economics, 2nd edition (Cincinnati: South-Western, 1956), Ch. 4 and Appendix A; also H. G. Heneman, Jr., "Conceptual Systems of Industrial Relations," Manpower and Applied Psychology, 1:2, Autumn 1967, pp. 95-101 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center Reprint No. 57). R. L. Ackoff, Scientific Method: Optimizing Applied Research Decisions (New York: Wiley, 1962). James G. Miller, "Living Systems: Basic Concepts," Behavioral Science, 10:3, July 1965, pp. 193-237, and "Living Systems: Structure and Process," and "Living Systems: Cross-Level Hypotheses," Behavioral Science, 10:4, October 1965, pp. 337-79 and 380-411. A similar "living systems" approach (open systems) is found in Daniel Katz and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: Wiley, 1966). See also, A. C. Block, M. A. Broner and E. L. Peterson, "The Manager's Guide to Systems Analysis," Management Review, 56:12 (December 1967), pp. 4-14. An analysis of various systems is found in Walter Buckley, Sociology and Modern Systems Theory (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967).

At the outset, I believe we have the responsibility as scholars to declare ourselves, to make value judgments about what is important and critical. We need to:

1. Define the field, i.e., select a few major dependent variables for study.
2. Do a glossary of terms, i.e., develop common names and common definitions for variables.
3. Select relationships to study. Begin with those that look most promising based on current research knowledge.
4. Specify nature and direction of relationships between and among variables, e.g., show factor strengths, beta weights, or correlations.
5. Develop models and codify theories. Again be parsimonious.
6. Specify partial systems.
7. Build combinations of partial systems, hopefully into a general system or paradigm.
8. Develop mathematical models and systems, including step functions and buffer mechanisms.
9. Search out forces (that cause change in variables and relationships, i.e., make dynamic systems) including feedback loops.
10. Be patient, and work in successive approximations.

I would underscore the need for beginning--and patience. Even crude attempts at synthesis are preferable to our current substantive confusion. Employment behavior is complex! We must select and choose from an almost infinite number of variables and relationships. If industrial relations is to be a social science, it must systematize. I do not plead that every industrial relations investigator do this, only that some do--enough to reach consensus. Nor do I plead that everybody now work only on general systems research and drop his particular specialty within industrial relations.[18] But the general system is like a road map; any investigator can travel whatever path he pleases, but he will have the great advantage of knowing where he is in relation to the totality. He can be addative and effective. And by looking at the map and comparing it with research findings, we will know where we need to research; we will not always have to await problems. The systems approach can make it possible for us to maximize the contributions of industrial relations research.

---

[17] Abstracted from H. G. Heneman, Jr., "Toward A General Conceptual System of Industrial Relations: How Do We Get There?" (Madison: University of Wisconsin Industrial Relations Research Institute, March 1966, mimeo.

To take the words of T. S. Eliot ("Little Gidding") out of context:

"We shall not cease from exploration,
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time."

---

[18] Indeed an excellent case can be made for emphasis on developing partial systems, or segments of the field. Committees of scholars could be assembled for this purpose. Their functions could be similar to SSRC committees. IRRA might be strengthened if divided into divisions, e.g., as in the American Psychological Association. For dangers in a segmental approach, however, see W. Ross Ashby, "The Effect of Experience on A Determinatic Dynamic System," Behavioral Science, 1:1 (1956), pp. 35-42.

DISCUSSION

Edward B. Jakubauskas
Iowa State University

There has been no shortage of evaluations of the discipline of industrial relations and industrial relations research. Even a superficial glance at the literature reveals a significantly large accumulation of articles, books, and conference proceedings on this subject.

Industrial relations, a relatively new discipline, appears in a sense to be like an introspective youth who is uncertain of his identity, questions his past, and continually ponders his future. He follows current headlines and tries to be responsive to what he considers to be the pressing issues of the day. He may also wistfully decry current preoccupation with headlines as he occasionally persists in following headlines of the 1930's and 1940's. He also has a keen sense of locating himself close to the center of change in society, and in many cases assisting the direction of change through his dual and alternating citizenship between the academic and nonacademic action world. However, having placed himself near the center of the decision-making, our industrial relations research scholar has the tendency of becoming so embedded in public affairs and particular problems that he has the uneasy feeling that he must legitimize his activity as research both to himself and to the academic community.

There are at least four different and conflicting concepts of industrial relations research presented in the panel papers:

(1) One concept seems to view industrial relations as interdisciplinary research done either by teams of scholars from a number of social sciences, or by individuals trained within industrial relations as such. We pay homage to the hope that we will get good interdisciplinary research, yet we have too few scholars working either in teams or trained specifically in industrial relations to evaluate performance.

(2) A second concept considers the research of members of the Industrial Relations Research Association. There have been periodic surveys of the IRRA membership to determine the changing nature of research. But most of the membership is not located in industrial relations centers. Consequently, this would give us little data for the theme of our panel--and, in addition, members for the most part are probably unconcerned about whether their research is classified as "industrial relations."

(3) A third concept, suggested by Mr. Heneman, defines industrial relations research in terms of the "employment relationship." This definition, of course, includes virtually all aspects of social science research, extending far beyond the work of formal industrial relations centers and the membership of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

(4) A fourth concept (suggested by Mr. Derber) limits discussion of industrial relations research to 15 industrial relations centers that have been in operation from the mid-1950's to the present time. An interesting analysis of structural changes in the nature of research is presented which closely follows the IRRA surveys on this subject. Analysis of what the 15 centers are doing understates certain structural changes by not including the many "human resource," "manpower," and "poverty" resource centers which have been formed in the past five years.

As brought out in Mr. Derber's paper, structural changes can also be misleading if we look meerly at the 15 industrial relations centers, because of the "spinoff" of certain areas of research to the Labor Historians Association, the Academy of Management, etc.

The central question for discussion, however, should be: "How can better research be generated at the frontiers of knowledge by research centers which are concerned with the employment relationship, and how can this knowledge be applied more efficiently to the solution of problems?"

There are at least five major directions that can be taken by research centers which would enhance the value and application of research. These include:

(1) Synthesis of research by major topical areas. It would be a worthwhile activity for centers to sponsor well-prepared syntheses of research findings along the Parnes' SSRC Labor Mobility Model,[1] or the President's Annual Manpower Report. This is not a recommendation for another set of conference proceedings, but rather for a long-term endeavor which would be carefully prepared and would integrate and synthesize knowledge in a topical area from a wide range of publications.

(2) An "Employment Model" on a Regional and/or National Basis. Beyond a synthesis of knowledge by topical areas, a major methodological and substantive

---

[1] Herbert S. Parnes, Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States, Bulletin Number 65 (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954).

change along the lines of the Brookings-sponsored Econometric Model of the United States[2] is critically needed in industrial relations. An "Employment Model" on a regional and/or national basis would be entirely feasible for a multidisciplinary research center. Such a model would be predictive in nature, would involve many disciplines, and whatever tools of research that would be needed, and would be "employment oriented."

(3) Large-Scale Data System. There is much validity in the criticism that the small-sample survey has been wasteful of research resources. In spite of limited value, the small-survey approach has continued to be promoted because of our medieval master-apprentice approach in developing M.S. and Ph.D. students, and in the propensity of academic administrators to "count" rather than to "evaluate" research publications. The usefulness of research through small-sample surveys and the individual "jack-of-all trades" scholar is rapidly becoming obsolete. We should look toward the development of regional and national data collection systems, along the pattern established by the Coleman Report in education.[3] The Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics in a close working relationship with industrial relations research centers would produce much more meaningful and useful research.

(4) Cooperative Study of Industrial Relations Problems. It is entirely feasible, and it would be useful for a number of research centers to pool their resources and talents for cooperative research developed around subject matter clusters within industrial relations. A useful model for this approach is the "Inter-University Project for the Study of Labor Problems in Economic Development."[4]

Developed by Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison, and Myers, the Inter-University Project has involved work in at least 35 countries, and 78 persons of 11 different nationalities. From this project has emerged a large number of publications which have, even more significantly, been refreshing attempts to operate in pioneering areas.

(5) Toward an "Experimental" Industrial Relations Discipline. My last comment will perhaps arouse the greatest opposition. If industrial relations research is to be truly research, and if it is to be used by action-agencies, it

---

[2] James S. Duesenberry (ed.), The Brookings Quarterly Econometric Model of the United States (Chicago : Rand McNally, 1965).

[3] James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966).

[4] Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Fredrick H. Harbison, Charles A. Myers, Industrialism and Industrial Man: The Problems of Labor and Management in Economic Growth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

must be predictive and it must also become experimental. There are a number of areas where research of an experimental nature has been taking place, though on a very small scale. The experimental and demonstration program of the Manpower Administration, the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education, and the Office of Economic Opportunity have sponsored research projects which control an experimental situation. OEO's experiment in testing the negative income tax through payments to families in New Jersey is suggestive of the experimental approach. Also, the United States Department of Labor's experimental program in labor mobility, and also the Iowa State Manpower Development Council (which was an experiment in statewide coordination of manpower programs) are illustrative cases of the experimental approach.

There are dangers involved in experimentation, and I would not suggest a large-scale launching of experimental programs. Properly conducted, and with safeguards, results in this area could provide major breakthroughs in research findings and application to problems.

Industrial relations centers ought not be unduly concerned about following headlines. In fact, an argument could be made for a closer working relationship with action-agencies, leading to a better utilization and application of research in the solution of employment problems. Industrial relations centers ought to be concerned about modernizing operations by: (1) adopting new tools of research; (2) synthesizing the vast output of research; (3) developing large-scale analytical structures, data collection procedures, and industrial relations systems; and (4) developing an "experimental" approach to industrial relations.

Wallace G. Lonergan
The University of Chicago

I feel that both papers have presented effectively an overview of current research in industrial relations, how changes in research directions have come about, and some of the reasons why. I also feel both authors have pointed out the limitations in their information and difficulties in generalizing from it. In short, I feel they have been both frank and fair in their assessment of the situation and in their self-assessments.

I would like only to add to the presentations some other possible reasons for the shifts in research emphasis and to analyze the roles that various industrial relations centers and individual research take in advancing knowledge and contributing to the solution of problems in both the public and private sectors. One reason why it is hard to understand the changing patterns is that little codification exists of the activities and roles of social scientists and practitioners who engage in action research and in policy planning for agencies and organizations, or who serve as consultants to leaders and managers of organizations.

The focus of activities in industrial and labor relations, not to mention the values underlying the field, makes it apparent at this historical moment that the codification of the roles of industrial relations experts should be documented by those scientists who are engaged in action research, development, or intervention, in order to expand the knowledge of activity in this area, to further research on the change process itself, and to assist those who have aspirations to engage in this worthwhile activity.

I would like to suggest that a model for the analysis of selected change roles would help in understanding both the shift in emphasis in industrial relations research and its current contribution as a policy science.

The process of development used in improving organizations which is being studied in various projects of the Industrial Relations Center of The University of Chicago involves seven phases:

(1) To develop awareness of problems and needs of individuals in the organization.

(2) To diagnose the reasons for problems and establish high priority problem areas.

(3) To develop plans of action and to establish a communication vehicle for recommendations for solutions, further study, or training.

(4) To conduct training seminars, involving knowledge, input, skill development through group process, role simulation, case analysis, and observation techniques.

(5) To assist the organization with tools and structures for implementation of the plans of action, and reviewing the recommendations.

(6) To assist the organization in evaluations of the effects of the program implemented.

(7) To assist the organization in the revision of plans, and development of long-range objectives.

Let's now look at the way this development process is applied by various industrial and labor relations specialists and groups.

PRACTITIONERS: the leader or manager who applies knowledge, skill, and experience to solve the problems in the operating system.

He establishes awareness of problems and needs by collecting information or mapping experiences. The diagnosis of the reasons and causes is done from experience of a theory of operations. He formulates plans and implements them. He has full responsiblity for the results and a commitment to make his program work. Evaluation consists of his review and, perhaps, his boss's, followed by continuation or revision of the program.

PERSONAL CONSULTANT: usually an individual who helps the leader or manager solve problems but is external to the system.

Awareness of problems is established by collecting information for clients and mapping vicarious experiences. The consultant will assist the leader in the diagnosis from data and his experience with other organizations. Generally he and the leader will jointly formulate plans and set up personal simulations or practice sessions. He may advise the leader on implementation, but he has no responsibility to the organization. His commitment is a personal one to the leader or manager he is advising. He may assist in the evaluation of results and in revision. The relations may be sustained as long as they are mutually helpful.

CONSULTANT TO CLIENT SYSTEM: usually a group who help leaders or managers solve a system's problem involving part or the whole organization.

They begin by collecting information for the clients on their organiation system. Diagnosis is accomplished from these data and experience from other organizations. The consultants then recommend a plan of action. Usually there is no simulation or practice for implementation. However, there may be meetings where the plan is "sold." In the implementation of the program, it is up to the organization to make it work; the consulting relationship does not often include evaluation. It is common for the consultant to re-enter the organization to conduct new studies, especially when the relationships have been satisfactory.

APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: this role involves relationships with leaders and managers to develop the application of knowledge.

Awareness of the need to improve is established by collecting information jointly with the organization or group within a theoretical framework. The diagnosis involves helping the client's system relate knowledge from the data to a framework for improvement. Planning involves formulating objectives and plans jointly with the client's system. Demonstration, simulation, or practice for implementing the plan is handled through education and training programs throughout the operating system. In implementation, as in the consulting roles, no responsibility for making the plan work is involved. There is a shared commitment to help make it work, and this involves the entire organization. There may also be experimentation through the development of prototypes. This role may involve a contract for organization-wide implementation. Evaluation is an essential part of this model. It is done jointly with the organization through systematic documentation that is replicable. The replanning involves testing progress against plans, data, and framework. It also involves a planned withdrawal as the skills and tools are taken over by the organization. Essentially, the action research model combines the role of the social science researcher in the first three stages and the adult educator or development agent in the fourth and fifth stages. The role of the social scientist predominates in the sixth phase and the consultant in the seventh phase of the process.

BASIC RESEARCH: this role involves the creation of knowledge.

Information on an operating system is collected within a theoretical framework. The information is analyzed in terms of that framework, and conclusions are reached that involve action or further research. There is no training or implementation involved in the relationship. Evaluation consists of replication of the findings in other controlled situations. It may involve a re-study and the publication of the findings.

All of these "change roles" are part of the industrial and labor relations picture at present and are likely to be in the future. Much of the research and development work has taken place within one or more of the role definitions described. This must continue if the professionals are to make their contribution to improving both the policy framework and the practice of industrial relations. Although the shift in research and program emphasis seems to follow the interests of funding groups, it may also be that change roles, more clearly defined and understood, would also help explain them. I feel that any field concerned with improving policy and practice will be more action-oriented and applied in its approach. We should acknowledge this and get on with our mission. This acknowledgement reinforces the contribution of basic research from all the fields to industrial relations and, through more effective and efficient application, to society.

William A. Westley
McGill University

We have heard two excellent papers on research in industrial relations, both by men with such experience in this field that it is difficult for me to do more than raise some general issues which may be useful in selecting the problems for research and thus guiding the research strategy of industrial relations centers. To this end, I would suggest that research strategy should be based on both a theory of industrial relations and a model of the state of society. The theory would raise general questions and provide guidelines for the development of an integrated body of knowledge. The model of society would help us select among the questions those most relevant to the state of society in which we find ourselves today.

A Theory for Industrial Relations

There are many possible theoretical approaches, but among these I would like to suggest, perhaps almost as much for illustrative as for recommended purposes, the model of the community. This involves the assumption that industrial relations is increasingly a community rather than an industry-labor function. While in the past the relationships between labor and management may have been within a system, the boundaries of which covered only these two parties, today, this is largely untrue. I make this observation for the following reasons.

In the past, work was regarded as a segment which could be studied because it was differentiated from other kinds of activities. Today the boundary between work and other activities is an artificial one, for increasingly, work is just part of the flow of activity of a man. It has become more difficult to differentiate between work and nonwork, so that the phrase "many men play at work and work at play" conveys the idea that it is in nonwork areas that they make their major status investment. I prefer to think that it means that work is an integral part of a larger flow of activities rather than a segmented part, and that being an integral part, it is so intertwined with them that the responses of the worker to work cannot be understood unless we also understand how he feels about his other activities.

An extreme version of this may arise from the fact that in the near future, men may be able to choose whether or not they work. Ideas such as the negative income tax, guaranteed annual income, and so forth, all provide a basis for making work an activity option. You work, in other words, as an activity you freely choose. You may choose not to work and to devote your energies and your status to nonearning areas.

Work is also increasingly governed by the same rules as politics, for as we become an increasingly rationalized and planned society, almost all activities have become work and almost all parts of work come under the involvement and control of government. So that, again, even in an area like industrial relations, you cannot understand what is happening without involving a study of the government itself.

Other activities increasingly compete with work as status indicators--activities such as public service, sports, social activities--so that the worker partakes of an elitist orientation or becomes a kind of aristocracy. Certainly if that older vision of life is kept in mind, we can have the vision of work as being only one status indicator, and therefore, not necessarily meaning so much to the man.

At work, as in other activities, older distinctions between age, life style, education, sex, and income are weakening. Thus, while it has long been supposed that at least work and the family were closely related, so that a man might take out on his wife and children what his boss had taken out on him and vice versa, both these ancient and powerful pivots on conduct are becoming submerged in public conduct. This perspective is, in my mind, a community theory of industrial relations, which sees work as part of the round of activity. It means that if we are to understand the man who works, to understand his idea of himself, his idea of work, his ambitions, his productivity, his relationship to management, we must understand him as a man in the community, and the theories of community development, community activity or action, and community organization would have a very important bearing.

Industrial Relations in Terms of a Model of the State of Society

Here, I wish to argue that if we are to select the most relevant problems for industrial relations centers, they should be guided by a conception of the state of the society in which we live and major social trends. To illustrate this, I would point to the dramatic changes taking place in the historical position of the working classes in highly industrialized and modern societies.

Specifically, I refer to the dramatic increases in the levels of affluence and education, which need no documentation but which are transforming the political and life perspectives of these people from a relative acceptance of subordination and an acknowledgement of intellectual and moral inferiority to a rejection of these differences. This, in turn, has given rise to new demands for pariticipation, new standards of leadership, and new standards of egalitarianism between ages, sexes, and ethnic and occupation groups. The tensions arising from these changes are reflected in the present race and student disturbances and will soon be found in politics, union operations, and the managerial structure of industry. I would suggest that if this image of our society today were true--and I think it is--then our major strategies would be to focus on the nature of these new working groups, on the lines of influence which are developing among the workers themselves, between workers and management, between workers and the political structure and the community, and finally, the problems of involvement and neutralization of new affluent, highly educated citizens. The disruption and the frictions arising from the attempt to encase these new peoples in old frameworks are obvious to us all. It seems to me that an image of society like this would permit us to select those industrial relations research problems of greatest relevance to the development and understanding of our society.

RESIDENT INSTRUCTION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CENTERS

Herbert Zollitsch, Chairman

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Alan C Filley
University of Wisconsin

The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) to identify common themes, dilemmas, and goals of industrial relations graduate programs and (2) to describe in more detail the evolving nature of the program at The University of Wisconsin. I emphasize the latter, not because it should be considered a model program, but because I have shared in the agonies of its evolution and know more about it than about other programs. In reviewing the current bulletins of a number of industrial relations programs, I find notes both of encouragement and of dismay. On the brighter side such programs seem to be growing in size and number, with innovative curricula, with adaptation to current problems, and with extension of the multiple disciplines represented.

Problems in Industrial Relations Programs

Yet there are serious problems as well. I do not see a new discipline emerging or even a true interdisciplinary approach emerging. Industrial relations faculties seem to have given up the idea of meshing conventional disciplines and now speak of a multidisciplinary approach. That this is the case is somewhat sad, for it is recognition that artificial discipline boundaries and probably the conventional wisdom of those disciplines must pervade programs which are generally established to focus on problems and issues. The few examples of interdisciplinary efforts which have worked suggest that necessary conditions include a well-defined set of goals, a removal of the group to a setting in which they can interact freely over time, sufficient rewards to make a reorientation of thinking attractive, and high mutual expectations regarding the program values.

Another serious problem seems to be the lack of theory to orient industrial relations thinking. Perhaps the reason for this dearth of theory is the reliance on description to be found in the literature of labor and industrial relations. Lacking analysis and abstraction, the study of labor-management relations is rich with descriptive substance but poor in the theoretical material necessary to extend the field. In contrast with industrial relations, the interest in problems of economic development has produced an abundance of good theory eminating from empirical studies on the subject and incorporating the theory of many disciplines. It is quite easy to provide a meaningful course on the theory of economic development; one is hard pressed to do so in this area.

The issue of theory is also related to the difficulty of providing advanced work in the industrial relations area. Where students take an extensive course program spanning many departments and disciplines, it is far more difficult for them to take intermediate and advanced graduate courses in the conventional disciplines. Since there is no unity provided by a theory of industrial relations, the industrial relations program cannot provide advanced courses either. Thus to overstate only slightly, the student either finds himself in a so-called interdisciplinary program concentrating in a conventional discipline or finds himself taking an amalgam of different courses at a fairly basic level.

Another problem operating in this field is the academic Gresham's Law which seems to be endemic to loose programs where bases of comparison between students are difficult to establish. Students in economics, for example, will typically take several courses together, permitting more flexible entrance requirements and the elimination of poorer students in the competition of the education process. Lacking such opportunities, industrial relations programs often have rigorous standards of admission in order to avoid becoming dumping grounds for students unacceptable to conventional academic departments. This seems to be a sad situation for programs that should be models of innovation and flexibility.

Industrial relations programs also seem to have some difficulty in attracting appropriate faculty members or in maintaining their interest. Faculty trained in prestigious disciplines identify themselves first as economists, psychologists, etc., and then as members of an industrial relations faculty. I note that a number of industrial relations programs have joint appointments for their faculty with traditional departments, apparently for much the same reason.

Finally, while industrial relations graduates do well in the business, union, and government job markets, they find greater difficulty in locating jobs in teaching. Generally they go into departments of economics or personnel management, even though they may have had extensive education in organization behavior, sociology, psychology, international relations, and the like. For this reason, students press for real or artificial identification with a conventional discipline in their educational program.

An Evolving Industrial Relations Curriculum

Many of these problems appear in our program at The University of Wisconsin. Our own Industrial Relations Research Institute began to offer the Masters's and Doctor's degrees in 1956 as an addition to a research program started in 1947. Wisconsin is quite flexible with regard to its graduate degrees in all areas, permitting combined programs under the direction of faculty committees where a student does not wish to be bound by the limits of a regular departmental offering.

Since the first job of the Institute was to demonstrate that the industrial relations program was unique, not duplicating course or program offerings in other departments on campus, the initial curriculum specified three ambiguous areas of concentration. This arrangement permitted the student to take complementary courses from traditional departments together with very limited seminar offerings in the industrial relations program itself. The Wisconsin program has never had its own faculty; it relies instead on the voluntary cooperation of faculty in various departments to serve on committees and advise students. Most active in this regard are the labor economists who fall most readily into the mainstream created by Commons, Witte, and Perlman and who can maintain their separate identity in economics more easily through the Institute. The other active group includes the personnel and organization behavior people from the Business School who teach many of the courses taken by industrial relations students. Faculty from many other departments on campus are also represented. The early program was administered by a single director who reported to the dean of the College of Letters and Science.

While the early program was blessed with a great many excellent students, its ambiguity led to vastly different forms of student education. Some students had intensive work under the tutelage of a single professor. Others had primarily advanced undergraduate work in preparation for the degree, while still others came into the program with strong preparation and took essentially graduate courses. Thus, even though these students passed their written examinations and produced acceptable theses, they often had quite different levels of attainment. Since competence in statistics was assumed, but never specified, the product of a research oriented degree sometimes had little preparation in the tools necessary to do research.

In the 1964-65 academic year a new director and associate director entered the Institute and the industrial relations program was reorganized and expanded. Particularly helpful in providing resources was the addition of a Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education funded by the Ford Foundation. The new educational program specified seven areas of concentration. Master's candidates select one of these as a major and another as a minor. In addition, the candidate is expected to have a general knowledge of the industrial relations field. He is expected to take seminar work in the major, elementary and advanced statistics, and industrial relations orientation and theory seminars. He also has a written comprehensive examination, a thesis, and a final oral examination.

A Ph.D. candidate must have completed a Master's degree and must take the basic statistics and industrial relations seminar requirements from our own Master's program if he has not done so. The candidate selects one of the seven areas as his major and three of the remaining six as a minor. In addition to seminar work in the major and in one of the three areas in the minor, the candidate takes an additional course in research methodology and another in the specific statistical or quantitative technique to be used in the dissertation. One foreign language is also required.

The logic behind these programs illustrates the alternatives available in building an industrial relations curriculum. First, in order to standardize the attainment level of students, our curriculum committee considered two basic alternatives. One was to prescribe prerequisite coursework for all incoming students, a practice at many schools. The other was to specify the upper attainment level in terms of an advanced, year-long seminar in major or minor areas, thus assuming that some students would need greater preparation for seminars than others. Wishing to avoid the rigidity of prerequisites, we have chosen the latter path.

With regard to the statistics requirements, we permit the student to select his courses from among those offered by appropriate departments on campus. While the examples used in the courses differ, they generally cover about the same material. Because courses in statistics are often taught with primary emphasis upon the mechanics and theory of the statistical technique, however, the student often sees little connection between these techniques and the practical problems of doing research. For this reason it has seemed important that courses in the logic and methods of research be offered to parallel the courses in statistics. We do make this requirement at the Ph.D. level and offer our own industrial relations research methods course for these students. Eventually I hope that the course will also be required at the Master's level. In reviewing the programs at other schools, it appears that regular discipline requirements in statistics and research are often far ahead of industrial relations programs in this regard. In addition, except for oblique references to the virtues of quantitative methods, I find that mathematical courses are rarely to be found in industrial relations curricula. Since model building is at least one way to theorize, it would seem useful to develop such skills in industrial relations students.

Students are advised by the associate director the first semester that they enter the program. As soon as they get acquainted with faculty members in their major area of interest, they select a major professor and an advisory committee to take over the job of supervising their course program, examination, and thesis. Here is where the use of an informally affiliated faculty becomes both an advantage and a problem. it is an advantage to have prestigious faculty from around the campus associated with our program. We avoid duplication of faculty and have a great deal of flexibility in planning specific student programs. On the other hand, it is difficult to maintain an integrated program where the faculty are literally spread throughout the entire campus. To offset this problem the Institute has recently initiated monthly luncheon meetings of faculty and students as well as "area committees" in each of the seven areas of speciality in the program. The latter provide for interaction of faculty and students within specific content areas to discuss current issues, planned courses in future semesters, and the content of courses related to industrial relations.

The complexity of this issue regarding faculty affiliation is highlighted in a survey recently conducted by the officers of our Industrial Relations Graduate Student Association. Asked what they liked best about the program, they indicated a preference for the program's interdisciplinary approach and flexibility in allowing students to select courses. Next in order of preference were (1) the faculty, (2) the size and informality of the program, and (3) the encouragement of research. In sharp contrast with the first advantage, when asked what they disliked most about the program, students stressed the lack of a program integrated with other departments and reliance upon a faculty with a limited commitment. Similarly, when asked for suggestions to improve the program, the most frequent suggestion was for a separate industrial relations department with its own faculty and administration. We continue to discuss this anomaly, but at present feel that the advantage of the present arrangement outweighs the disadvantage of an integrated faculty which might duplicate faculty in other departments.

The joint appointments which I note in program descriptions at other schools seem to be less desirable than either a permanent faculty or our own informal arrangement. My limited observation of joint appointments suggests that the faculty member generally devotes his time and energy in the one department which is closest to his interest, which controls the resources used in his job, and which most strongly affects his professional lifestream. It would be interesting to hear the actual experience of other industrial relations programs which do have joint appointments.

Another issue which is urrently plaguing us is the thesis requirement for the Master's degree. Like all educational programs which have applied on vocational aspects, the industrial relations program may lean in the direction of a professional degree such as the M.B.A. in a school of business or in the direction of a research oriented degree. Our emphasis and the stated emphasis in other programs which have been reviewed clearly opts for the research approach. In fact, our executive committee has just rejected the idea of a nonthesis option for the M.S. degree, feeling that it would reduce the emphasis on research. The committee did approve a possible new Master's degree without a thesis for students who would not be going on for a Ph.D. and would be entering the profession after the Master's program. This sounds reasonable, yet it does raise the question of a student who changes his mind after taking a nonthesis program or the equity regarding a Master's student from another school with a nonthesis option who enters our Ph.D. program. Here again the experience of other industrial relations programs would be most helpful.

A final comment seems warranted regarding the research programs of universities in general and industrial relations program in particular. With universities doing classified research for the military and government, with federal agencies offering an irresistible "carrot" of research funds, and with large private agencies funding research programs of their own interest, it would seem that research units are being led primarily into areas of interest dictated by other than themselves. There are large sums available for labor market studies, problems of minority groups, or those of aging or poverty, but there is little money to support studies of union organization, trends in collective bargaining, or other topics in the mainstream of industrial relations. Whether the answer is persistent, independent dedication by the faculty member, or more enlightened support programs by funding agencies, I don't know. But the problem is certainly real. To paraphrase Thoreau, let us step to the music which we hear, however measured or far away.

even in the world of labor unions where the speciality might be expected to be of the greatest value.

Even though I support the approach of giving degrees in the traditional disciplines, I would not accept without analysis John Crispo's statement yesterday, when he said that the best producers are those who have a strong disciplinary base rather than a little bit of this and that. The fact that most of the production comes from people so trained may be more a product of the fact that most of the institutions turning out those concerned with writing in industrial relations and related topics do not give degrees in the subject. This, of course, has not prevented many of the best producers from practically leaving their disciplines after their degrees. I believe that this is the way it should be. The system works within the framework of this kind of an approach.

A degree in a traditional subject does provide specific knowledge and a base from which the degree-holder can work. Further, I believe that a university can do a better recruiting job using the bases of a department and a center, and not just a center as the home area for the individual being recruited. Generally speaking (the great academic and money draw of Cornell excepted), it could be argued that a distinguished department in a particular discipline can best attract an outstanding scholar concerned with one or another aspect of industrial relations. An additional incentive can be and is a research association with a center. I would like to think that the opportunity to meet and interact with labor and management representatives would be an additional attraction.

Contrary to some of the experiences suggested yesterday, we have been reasonably successful at Michigan and at Wayne State in staffing our off-campus, labor-management courses with faculty members. Something like nine out of ten of our labor education courses are taught by regular faculty members. Those who administer the program believe that this is important. However, they do not hesitate to go to the community when necessary.

I believe that the great contribution which has been made by industrial relations institutes is to provide interdisciplinary centers to afford scholars the opportunity to meet and to study problems relating to work. It goes without saying that few, if any, of us would feel bound to be concerned only with collective bargaining and directly related problems. The drift seems to have been away from that area in recent years.

The scholars who become attached to a center either by formal, continuing appointments or through ad hoc research arrangements, can expand their horizons by working with other faculty and with the outside world. Expanded research ideas and opportunities, not to mention the availability of sophisticated foundation grantsmanship, frequently results from this association. In all, an association with a center should place the faculty member with an appointment in a department of his home discipline in a better position to teach matters relating to the word of work to students who have registered in a particular discipline for whatever reason. I would like the students in a discipline to be able to take advantage of the expanded training of concerned faculty. If the student is interested in industrial relations, he should be able to get the basic tools he needs from the discipline which he happens to choose. If he wants to be a generalist in what I submit is not yet an academic discipline, he will have plenty of time after he becomes a professor or afterhe goes out into the world of business or government.

In this discussion, I have generally refrained from discussing the expanding area of noncredit teaching of industrial relations courses but I would like to say in passing that our program at Wayne State in Michigan has had the greatest demand for knowledgeable, sympathetic specialists who know their basic disciplines well and can teach them. Generalists can be recruited with relative ease to teach what are becoming traditional, collective bargaining techniques courses. But there has been a little more difficulty in filling the great demand for the industrial psychologist, the psychologist, and the economist in our labor-management courses.

In summary, I submit that degrees--special degrees--are not needed in a field that, as Milton Derber suggested yesterday, is in many ways impossible to define. Here, I except our good friends at Cornell with their system which offers a great range of specialization on a national basis for those who wish to go all out in this subject. However, with Cornell providing this opportunity, I do not think that it is necessary for the rest of us to try to compete.

DISCUSSION

Paul L. Kleinsorge
University of Oregon

I am addressing myself particularly to Alan Filley's paper. I find myself in agreement with much of what he has said in his well organized report. My differences are a matter of degree. I believe that I am less pessimistic concerning the state of industrial relations programs that he appears to be. I think that the lacks or failures of the past may be turned into gains and successes in the future, and the very near future at that. For instance, he says that industrial relations programs seem to have given up the idea of meshing conventional disciplines. Probably this is true at the moment. But actually there have not been many significant attempts to develop an interdisciplinary theory in industrial relations. There has been a lack of effort rather than a failure. To me, it seems premature to conclude that some kind of an interdisciplinary theory cannot emerge.

Nearly all of us who have been engaged in teaching or research or actual practice in industrial relations since World War II profess to be interested in the interdisciplinary approach; yet we have contributed very little in the way of substantive interdisciplinary theory and interdisciplinary research to the field. We have been to absorbed in our own segmented areas. But what of the younger men--those educated from the late 1950's on? They are often interdisciplinary in thought and in action. When they take over, I expect a different atmosphere to develop. There are several traditional areas involving industrial relations which are overdue for transformation through interdisciplinary approaches. It will take exceptional men to do the job, but I think these exceptional men will appear, and it is not necessary that there be many of them. How many exceptional men did it take to transform economics during the past 30 or so years?

Mr. Filley is right in saying that there is a lack of theory to orient industrial relations thinking, but this does not mean that such theory cannot be developed as was done in his example of the field of economic development. If and when this theory is developed (as I think it will be), some of the other problems mentioned will come closer to solution--the problem of pulling the various areas together into a systematic and coordinated whole, the problem of attracting appropriate faculty members and maintaining their interest, and the problem of finding teaching jobs for graduates with advanced degrees in industrial relations. With regard to this last problem, there is a new generation of graduates who identify themselves as students of industrial relations, rather than as members of one of the "prestigious" disciplines. They are the chief reason for my optimism, plus the fact that the nature of many problems confronting society today is causing disciplinarians to review their narrow perspectives. I note particularly "manpower" and "poverty" in this regard. Let us not give up hope for industrial relations.

I turn now to Mr. Filley's discussion of the program at the University of Wisconsin which I found to be most interesting and very helpful. At the University of Oregon, our program is quite new (we began in 1964) and relatively small. We have much to learn. Our goals lie in three directions--research, labor education, and an interdisciplinary Master's degree program. Our Institute of Industrial and Labor Relations does no teaching. We rely upon courses given by other departments and schools for the required work toward the Master's degree. These schools and departments include business administration, economics, education, journalism, law, political science, and sociology. We have a new School of Community Service and Public Affairs with which we expect to cooperate very closely. All staff members of the Institute hold joint appointments, since it is a requirement of the University that all regular staff members be attached to a teaching department. This has caused the Institute considerable difficulty, particularly in the area of labor education, because often the people best suited to the Institute's work are not acceptable to the teaching departments. As to the Master's degree program, our job is largely advisory--to see to it that the student follows a well coordinated, logical course of study. We are just beginning to offer seminars of our own to try to bring together the diverse programs which our individual students follow. Incidentally, this development was suggested by the students themselves, strongly seconded by one of the "younger generation" I spoke of previously. As yet we do not offer a Doctor's degree, and probably we never shall, although industrial relations may be offered as a field for the doctorate with a major in another discipline.

With this organization, we are meeting some of the same problems encountered by the University of Wisconsin. Some students work closely with one professor; others do not. Some students concentrate rather heavily in one area; others tend to diversify. From Mr. Filley's description of the University of Wisconsin's experience, various urgent improvements in our own program become apparent, particularly with regard to the statistics requirement, which is so essential in research. It is unfortunate, however, that a course in "statistics" may be offered by several departments, and that they vary greatly in content and in depth. I shall appreciate some advice as to which type of statistics course is best suited to industrial relations students.

At the University of Oregon, students of industrial relations are advised by members of the Institute. But the students have varied interests, and aside from the seminars mentioned before, there is no way for them to meet in meaningful conversations, particularly when the faculty is scattered throughout the campus. The Wisconsin solution of luncheon meetings is excellent, if it will work, but I doubt that sustained interest could be aroused in such meetings at the University of Oregon. To me, a more satisfactory (and the only permanent) solution must be the development of an industrial relations system which will bring us together because we have a common area of work. As I said before, I am looking to the new men in our field to accomplish this through the integration of some kind of organization encompassing the interdisciplinary elements of industrial relations.

I have one more comment which concerns the thesis requirement. Ideally, an interdisciplinary degree of any kind should require a thesis which will tie together the various areas of the student's program. My experience is that this is rarely accomplished. The student writes in the field of industrial relations, but usually he concentrates in one area and forgets the others. At our University, the Master's degree in industrial relations may be attained without thesis, but an additional nine hours of course work is required plus an oral examination beyond the usual examinations. Most students avoid the thesis, and in view of the fact that it would not tie together the several areas, I cannot blame them, particularly since additional course work takes less time and is less demanding than a thesis.

All of which leads to a repetition of my basic point. We need more systematic organization of the industrial relations area to give it the body of a true discipline. The old War Labor Board boys (and I am one of them) did not do it. But all is not lost. There _is_ a new generation, and it is _here_.

Don Sheriff
University of Iowa

I have read with interest the papers of my distinguished colleagues on this panel. They have adequately and accurately described the curricular trends and changes that are taking place in industrial relations.

I share in Mr. Filley's concern that we seem to be giving up the idea of an interdisciplinary endeavor and are settling for a multidisciplinary approach. Also, I agree with him that where interdisciplinary efforts have worked, attention has been given to the setting of specific goals, and the individuals concerned are placed in a group setting where they are free to interact over time. This, of course, is one of the major values of an institute or center composed of its own faculty and not relying in toto on joint appointments or the availability of faculty from other departments, divisions, or colleges.

For my own part, I would like to make two comments directed not so much at the types or kinds of programs that are evolving, but at the qualitative aspects of these changes. Specifically, my observations will be in terms of the resultant types and kinds of experiences we are providing graduate students and their concomitant effect upon them as citizens and industrial relations practitioners.

Despite the curricular innovations that are taking place, which most of us applaud, we still see a lack of common objectives and a lack of program and course enrichment that is directed toward the development of professional managers, labor leaders, government officials, and academicians that will assist them in coping intelligently with the environment and the problems into which they will be introduced.

In 1958, Herbert Heneman characterized the objectives of industrial education as "fuzzy."[1] In the succeeding ten years his observation remains current. And because our objectives are "fuzzy," we not only build walls between the academic community and the business, labor, and government community, but within our own colleges and universities, within our industrial relations fraternity, and between our students. When some industrial relations centers and institutes do get around to looking at their objectives, they often follow a pattern of "follow the leader." I submit that one of the reasons we have difficulty in securing adequate research funds in certain areas is that we lack specific goals that are visible to some of the larger private and public funding agencies. They find it difficult to identify with us. Many industrial relations professors have written about the importance of and need for objectives; let's start applying this to ourselves.

---

[1] Proceedings of Eleventh Annual Meeting of Industrial Relations Research Association, IRRA, December 28-29, 1958, p. 237.

Again, I concur with Mr. Heneman when he said,

> Goals and objectives of industrial relations must not be determined per se, but in relation to the goals and objectives of organizations. Thus, we in the academic field must do much more research in this area before we can devote much time profitably to the question of what makes a good industrial relations curriculum.[2]

Second, more attention should be paid to finding ways to enrich the curriculum. For example, the student in a graduate program should be able to tap the knowledge of both the academic community and the business world. Colleges and universities no longer have a stranglehold on knowledge. Much significant research in industrial relations is taking place in industry. This dual foundation is necessary if the student is to be exposed to the best possible professional development. In other words, more thought should be given to ways in which the academic and business worlds can share the responsibility of providing an environment in which graduate students can best prepare to be future professionals.

There are many ways this can be accomplished. Some industrial relations centers have established visiting professorships where they bring to the campus a distinquished academician, industrialist, labor leader, or government official for one quarter, one semester, or an academic year. The man selected, depending on his background and interests, teaches in the graduate program, appears on continuing education programs, and undertakes short-term research projects. He and his family become part of that university's life.

The development and implementation of this kind of program not only helps bridge any walls between business, labor, and government, it enhances the curriculum. Where budgetary or other considerations make this kind of program impractical, talented men can be invited to spend a few days or weeks participating as discussion leaders in graduate seminars or participating in some adult education offering. Our own experience with a visiting professorship program and the use of guest session leaders has been most gratifying.

---

[2] Proceedings of Eleventh Annual Meeting of Industrial Relations Research Association, IRRA, December 28-29, 1958, p. 241.

This, of course, should work both ways. Members of the academic community should occasionally seek summer employment within business and labor, do consulting work, or perhaps participate as an instructor in a company's executive development program. Such interaction permits faculty members to test their ideas outside the classroom, usually results in on-campus course enrichment, and often opens up needed avenues for both applied and theoretical research.

Also, those engaged in arbitration and mediation work could occasionally take one or two students with them to a hearing, or on a consulting project. There are numerous possibilities for enriching resident instruction in industrial relations. The limits are only set by our available time and imagination. It has been our experience that when such attempts are undertaken, there is a multiplier effect that not only reaches the quality of the learning experiences provided to graduate students but also enhances the research and service functions.

Unfortunately, many of my colleagues throughout the country feel labor and management have an unfavorable attitude toward intellectuals which prohibits this kind of curriculum enrichment. Such is not the case. A 1961 Research Report of the Public Opinion Index for Industry notes that 76 percent of the surveyed executives had a favorable attitude toward intellectuals while 49 percent of the surveyed academicians guessed that the attitude of the business community toward them was unfavorable.

Finally, we seem to forget that the student orientation of today is different than the student orientation of the late 1940's and 1950's. Today's student is highly motivated, is more outgoing, is operating at a higher need level, and seeks (I am tempted to say demands) involvement in worthwhile causes. We owe it to them, our profession, and society to provide as meaningful an education as we can.

To often we follow instead of lead. As a result, we are somewhat late arrivals in the areas of race relations, public employment, problems of the aged, and poverty. This should not have been the case. This need not be the case. We can provide a better academic environment in which advanced degree candidates prepare for their life's work.

W. Donald Wood
Queen's University

I approach my task this morning with some reluctance for I feel that our discussion is simply a part of a long playing record that has been playing the same old melody and the same old lyrics for many years. If you examine the annual proceedings of almost any industrial relations or personnel association you will find periodic public confessionals decrying the second class status of industrial relations. The theme is always the same--the lack of rigorous theoretical underpinnings, the cleavage between theory and practice, the lack of intellectual cohesion and respectability, whether industrial relations should be a separate discipline in its own right, and whether the subject should be oriented to traditional basic disciplines or be interdisciplinary in nature.

In my opinion, this persistent negativism adds little to our field. Admittedly there are gaps in our knowledge and in some of our theoretical concepts, and we must continually strive to improve in these areas. But let us remember that other disciplines also have gaps in knowledge and theory. For example, reflect on the significant refinements of many traditional economic concepts required in the light of the steady shift in employment from goods to service industries--large segments of which have no profit motive. Moreover, as George Shultz pointed out in his excellent banquet address, we often overlook important achievements in our field--many of which are now providing valuable theoretical and research background for formulation of current public policies and programs.

I would suggest, therefore, that we have a moratorium on this periodic and aimless soul-searching. In the meantime, let us get on with the problems at hand and apply existing theory and knowledge more broadly and more rigorously in our teaching and research.

The excellent papers of Alan Filley and Ron Haughton have discussed the question of how we get on with the job of developing graduate programs in industrial relations. There probably is no one ideal approach or organizational structure for these programs. In any particular institution, they will be influenced and shaped by a number of factors--historical precedents, institutional philosophy, academic politics and personalities, available financial and faculty resources, the needs and demands for specific types of programs, etc. In other words, adopt the structure and approach which works best in the special circumstances of your particular institution, strive for excellence, and build on strengths rather than attempting to cover the entire spectrum of areas in this large and sprawling field.

I fully agree with Alan Filley's main conclusion that a new separate discipline of industrial relations is not emerging nor is a true interdisciplinary approach. It also seems to me that much of the confusion in the perennial debate of this subject is caused by the many differing definitions and concepts of the term "industrial relations." If our definition is so broad as to include the whole range of subject matter related to this field--labor economics, labor law, labor history, human relations and the behavioral sciences, collective bargaining and labor relations, and so forth--then we do not have a single, uniform theory covering all of these areas, and we probably never will have one. True, we may develop some broader frameworks for at least better understanding the variables and relationships operating in this field. But this will not provide an integrated body of theory that can be used as an operational, analytical tool. If we have such a broad concept of industrial relations and expect to pull this vast area under one theoretical umbrella, then it is not surprising that we feel frustrated.

We also should recognize that we do not automatically develop a single industrial relations discipline by offering a degree in the subject or by having all academic programs in this field in a single department or in a school of industrial relations. Although these approaches may well permit more flexibility and more appropriate emphasis in teaching the subject, they do not result in a single unified discipline or body of theory. They are simply different organizational or accounting units; the subjects and fields offered and faculty orientation will still tend to be clustered around various basic disciplines within these broader administrative systems.

If we look at particular areas within the industrial relations field, such as labor economics, then there already is a body of established theory. There are gaps in these theoretical constructs. And we have not exploited these theoretical tools and concepts as rigorously or as broadly as we could. But the solution is not to desert our basic discipline base, whatever it might be, but to improve it and make it more relevant for the broader field of industrial relations. It is my view that we have to rely largely on our mother discipline for new theoretical ideas, while at the same time being ready to accept any relevant concepts available in cognate disciplines.

At Queen's University, we have adopted this basic discipline approach with industrial relations being offered as a major field of study within the broader degree programs in economics, business, and law. Although academic appointments and teaching responsibilities are within the individual departments or schools, faculty do cross discipline lines for some of their teaching responsibilities. In addition, the Industrial Relations Centre coordinates and provides facilities and services for the research activities of faculty and postgraduate students from these separate disciplines. The Centre also has a full-time staff geared to its research, publishing, and continuing education programs. Since activities cut across departmental lines and since some of its functions are outside the normal scope of department responsibilities, the director reports to the principal on matters of policy and administration.

I would like to conclude by noting a number of trends which are slowly but steadily bringing various areas in the social sciences closer together and which should have a more unifying influence in the field of industrial relations. First, there are the greater opportunities in university academic programs for students to choose more options outside their main field of study, thereby at lease exposing them to other disciplines. Second, there are the expanding research activities of industrial relations centers facilitating the interchange of ideas between disciplines, even if not truly interdisciplinary in approach. In my own field of economics, there are also an increasing number of nonlabor economists examining labor aspects of current economic problems--e.g., manpower utilization, the war on poverty, social security and welfare issues, the trade-off question, incomes policies, etc. This development has had a valuable broadening and enrichening impact on both labor economics and on other areas of economics.

Finally, and probably most importantly, there are emerging slowly more common areas of methodology for many disciplines in the social sciences, particularly with the increasing emphasis on quantitative methods. In the future, I believe this will remove some of the artificial and rigid barriers between fields and may open up avenues for the formulation of new theories. This greater emphasis on basic quantitative approaches in a number of areas of industrial relations may also make our work of much greater practical relevance for business, labor, and government and this in turn may be a link for developing more relevant theory.

Against this background, therefore, I am optimistic about the future of industrial relations. Challenging new social and economic problems already are pressing in on our field at a frightening pace. Although this means that the future emphasis may be less on specific industrial relations problems, and more on the labor aspects of major socioeconomic problems, this does offer great opportunities for further development of industrial relations and coordination within the field!